School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1347627

# The Library

## SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Mr Sylvanus
Downs Esq
Monti-
Sullivan
Co.

BS
605
S3

THE

# CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL.

CONTAINING A

# HISTORY OF THE BIBLE,

FROM THE GIVING OF THE LAW, TO OUR PRESENT TRANSLATION.
A CONCISE VIEW OF THE DOCTRINES AND DUTIES OF
THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, WITH THE PRO-
MINENT ARGUMENTS AND PROOF-
TEXTS FOR THEIR SUP-
PORT;

TO WHICH ARE ATTACHED,

## QUESTIONS,

ADAPTED TO THE INSTRUCTION OF

FAMILIES, SABBATH-SCHOOLS, AND BIBLE CLASSES.

WITH AN APPENDIX.

BY S. R. SCOFIELD.
PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MECKLENBURG, N. Y.

"Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth."

ITHACA, N. Y.:
ANDRUS, GAUNTLETT, & CO.

1850.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1850, by S. R. Scofield, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Northern District of New York.

# PREFACE.

This little work, planned and partially completed before the author contemplated its circulation beyond the bounds of his own congregation, is designed to occupy a place, felt by many Pastors to be vacant—to furnish a MANUEL that treats in a brief, yet clear and systematic manner, upon the prominent doctrines and duties of the christian religion, which may safely be put into the hands of young christians and inquirers after truth; and where *all* may learn with little study, *what* orthodox churches believe, and *on what arguments* and scripture proofs their belief is based.

The author has studied to condense, and render clear the arguments for the defence of the truth, and to adapt the work to those who have little time or opportunity for study.

The questions, though they have considerably increased the expense of the work, add much to its value, especially for the young. The history of the Bible, it is believed, will be read with interest, and tend to increase our reverence for the word of God.

That this little volume may be useful in increasing a knowledge of the doctrines of grace, in awakening sinners. and in promoting holiness in the church, is the ardent prayer of the author.

*Mecklenburg, September*, 1850.

## DIRECTIONS.

Let one member of the family ask the questions, and others having the Manual, read the answer, which is referred to by a figure, corresponding with the number of the question.—Where the question is not numbered, the answer must be from inference. Set apart an hour for the study of the book, and persevere in it till all are familiar with its truths. Children may be encouraged to ask each other the questions.

*Superintendents* of Sabbath Schools and *teachers* of higher classes may ask the questions and enlarge upon the answers as they think proper.

---

### ERRATA.

Page 78, Insert, after the word expensive, seventh line from the top, the words, "than that of the true God."
" 115, sixth line from the bottom, read "prophesying," for prophesied.
" 132, 14th line from top, after the word affecting, insert "their freedom or."
" 135, 10th line from bottom, for the, read "thy."
" 143, 1st line from top, after show, insert "the."
" 147, 16th line from top, for now, read "more."
" 154, 15th line from top, for being, read "beings."
" 154, last line, for never read "have."
" 157, last line, for work, read "works."
" 161, 9th line from top, for dominions, read "dominion."
" 205, 3d line from top, for Rev. read "Prov."
" 229, 12th line from top, for dearly, read "clearly"
" 238, 11th line from top, for reparation, read "separation."
" 257, last line, insert "similar," after the words these are.
" 260, 5th line from bottom, before Lord, insert "way of the."
" 287, 1st line, for through, read "thorough."

# CONTENTS.

HISTORY OF THE BIBLE—Old Testament; Ten Commandments; Pentateuch; Autographs of Moses; Remaining books of the Old Testament; Lost books; Apochrypha; Samaritan Pentateuch; Septuagint, or Greek translation; NEW TESTAMENT—Gospels early written and circulated; Catalogue of books it now contains made in the third century; Syriac version; Vulgate or latin translation; Numerous MSS. of the Old and New Testaments, collected from all parts of the world; General agreement among them; English versions—Wickliff's; Tyndal's; Coverdale's; The Bishop's Bible. Our present version; Great care in its translation; Douray Bible; Facts for the curious. p 7—32

SUMMARY CONFESSION OF FAITH adopted by the Presbytery of Geneva. 33

ARTICLE I.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD—Proved; UNITY OF GOD—proved; PERFECTION OF GOD—Spirituality, Immensity, Immutability, Eternity, Omniscience, Omnipotence, Independence, Benevolence, Wisdom, Justice, Mercy, Grace and Truth, Holiness—each attribute defined and proved; GOVERNMENT OF GOD—Natural, Moral—each defined and proved; THE TRINITY—Divinity of Christ; Absurdity of denying the divinity of Christ. 40—74

ARTICLE II.

INSPIRATION—THE BIBLE FROM GOD—A revelation necessary; What was so necessary God's benevolence would grant; The Holy Scriptures that revelation, or we have none; The Bible exhibits a character beyond finite conception; Its writers good, or bad men, bad men would not write such a book, good men would not write a lie; The Bible the word of God or a forgery; No motive to forge such a book; The wisest and best men in all ages have believed the Bible to be the word of God; Scope and design of the Bible; Its influence; Miracles; Resurrection of Christ: Prophecy; The Arabs, Ammon, Edom, Babylon, Judea, Jerusalem and

the Jews; concerning Christ; Agreement among the sacred writers; Bible facts corroborated by profane history and tradition. 74—129

ARTICLE III.

THE FALL OF MAN—Depravity of Man—native—total. 129—141

ARTICLE IV.

THE ATONEMENT—Its sufficiency—its application—its necessity. 141—149

ARTICLE V.

SALVATION OFFERED—Voluntarily rejected; Influences of the Holy Spirit; Consideration; Conviction of sin; Regeneration; Sanctification or progressive holiness; Justification; Faith; Warrant of faith; Repentance; Its nature; Evidences of a change of heart; God's sovereignty; The PLAN of God; Election; Foreknowledge; Foreordination; Predestination and Decrees all embraced in the idea of a plan; What is no part of the doctrine of election. 149—196

ARTICLE VI.

THE SAINTS' PARSEVERANCE defined and proved. 196—207

ARTICLE VII.

PERFECT OBEDIENCE REQUIRED. THE BIBLE OUR DIRECTORY; Duties to God; Prayer ejaculatory; Secret; Family; Prayer meeting; Praise; THE SABBATH—Duties to man; To ourselves; Relative Duties; Husband and wife; Parent and child; Masters and servants; Oppression. 207—235

ARTICLE VIII.

BAPTISM—MODE; Infant baptism; The Lord's Supper. 235—289

ARTICLE IX.

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL; Resurrection of the body; Happiness of the Righteous; Condemnation of the wicked. 285—299

APPENDIX:

THE LICENSING OF MINISTERS; Ordination; Installation; Elders; Deacons; Session; Presbytery; Synod; General Assembly. Questions for Self-examination. 301

# CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL.

## HISTORY OF THE BIBLE.

As all christians acknowledge the word of God to be the foundation of their faith and practice—as their complete directory—it may not be unimportant for them to know something of its history. This will [1]increase their confidence in it as the word of God.

[2]The Holy Bible, [3]embracing in one volume the Old and New Testament, or more properly, covenant, is the oldest book in the world. By the Old Testament is meant [4]the dispensation under Moses. By the New, [5]that under Jesus Christ.

God chose [6]the Jews, the descendants of [7]Abraham by Isaac, as the depositaries of his revealed will. The Ten Commandments, recorded [8]in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, were written, [10]to show their perpetuity, [9]on tables of stone, by God's

---

1. What use in studying the history of the Bible? 2. What is the oldest book in the world? 3. What does it embrace? 4. What is meant by the Old Testament? 5. What is meant by the New? 6. What people were chosen to take care of the Bible? 7. From whom were they descended? 8. Where are the Ten Commandments recorded? 9. On what were they written? 10. Why?

own finger. Some regard this [1]as the first introduction of letters to the world.

### PENTATEUCH.

The first five books in our Bibles are called [2]the Pentateuch, and contain [3]the moral, ceremonial, and political law of the Jews. [4]It was written under the direction of God, by Moses, [5]whilst journeying with the Israelites in the desert. For safe keeping a copy of it was placed [6]in the Holiest of Holies, a place made sacred in the highest degree, by the presence of Jehovah. [7]None but the high-priest was permitted, or would have dared, to enter it, and he but once a year.

It was the policy of the Jewish nation to make all familiar with the law. They were required, therefore, to meet together and hear portions of it read [8]every sabbath, and [9]once in seven years, [10]on the year of release, or sabbatical year, [11]all, men, women and children were required to assemble and hear it all read. Deut. 31: 10–13.

[12]The king, on coming to the throne, was required to write out a copy of it for his directory, and to "read therein all the days of his life." Deut. 17: 18, 19. [13]The priests were required to "teach the

---

1. As what is this regarded by some? 2. What are the first five books in the Bible called? 3. What did they contain? 4. Under whose direction and by whom was it written? 5. Where? 6. Where was it placed? 7. Who alone was permitted to enter it, and how often? 8. How often did the people hear portions of the law read? 9. How often the whole of it? 10. When? 11. Who heard it? 12. What was the king required to do? 13. The priests?

children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord had spoken unto them by the hand of Moses." Lev. 10: 11. [1]Parents were strictly enjoined to teach them diligently to their children, to talk of them in their houses, and by the way side, when then lay down at night, and when they arose in the morning.

[2]Copies of the law were numerous. The king, priests, and judicial officers, and many heads of families must have possessed them, and were familiar with them [3]from infancy. [4]This familiarity with the law, would have made it impossible, for the high priests or any one else, to have corrupted or altered it, had they been disposed.

[5]The temple copy, probably the original autograph, or hand writing of Moses, was displaced from the side of the ark, during the idolatrous reign of Manasseh and Ammon, [6]and was found, on the accession of the pious Josiah, among the rubbish. 2 Chron. 34: 14. [7]It is probable that the public reading of the law had been suspended for some time previous to finding this venerable copy. This accounts for the great consternation manifested on hearing it read by Shaphan, the scribe. We have no evidence to believe but that copies of the law were numerous at this time among the people and priests, though greatly neglected.

1. Parents? 2 Had they more copies than one? 3. Was the mass of the people familiar with it? 4. Could the high priest have corrupted the law in his annual visits? 5. What became of the temple copy during the apostacy of Manasseh and Ammon? 6. Where was it found? 7. How do you account for the consternation on hearing the law read?

[1]It is generally supposed that the autograph of Moses, the tables of stone and pot of manna, were destroyed with the temple by Nebuchadnezzar.

The books of Moses, as were all the books in the Old Testament, were written [3]in the Hebrew language, from right to left, instead of from left to right, [2]on parchment, or the thin skin of animals, carefully dressed with a peculiar polish, which, when written on, was rolled up and called a book, or roll. The instrument of writing was a pen made from a reed.

### REMAINING BOOKS.

When any books were added to those written by Moses, as was done from time to time by persons divinely appointed, copies of these were also placed [4]in the side of the ark. Josh. 24: 26. 1 Sam. 10: 25.

In the later ages of the Jewish nation, many places had changed their names, as is common with us, and some words, once in common use, had become obsolete, and perhaps in some copies trifling mistakes had been made by copyists. [5]Ezra, being inspired of God, assisted by learned men of the great synagogue, made such corrections and alterations in the books previously written, as were ne-

---

1. What became of the autographs of Moses, the tables of stone, &c. ? 2. On what were the books of the Old Testament written ? 3. In what language ? Were these books made like ours ? 4. When any books were added to those written by Moses, where were copies placed ? 5. What work did Ezra perform ?

cessary to adapt them to his times. [1]He also adopted the Chaldee character in place of the old Hebrew, and substituted the names of places in common use for those that had become obsolete.

From the writing of the law, by Moses, to the writing of the last of the inspired books, by Malachi, 400 B. C., was [2]1091 years, and yet books had been added to the sacred canon, (books acknowledged as of divine authority,) [3]by different persons during every century, teaching [4]the same great leading truths. And many of them most bitterly denounced [5]the very people who held them in the highest reverence, clearly showing [6]their high origin. The Old Testament in its present form, embracing [7]thirty-nine books, which the ancient Jews divided so as to make only [8]twenty-two, to correspond with the letters in their alphabet, and the modern Jews [9]twenty-four; it is thought its present form was arranged [10]by Simon the just, 300 B. C.

### APOCRYPHA.

The Apocrypha is rejected by [11]Protestants as uninspired, trifling, and false in some of its details, and unworthy of a place in the sacred volume. [12]The Roman Catholics, as [13]it countenances some

1. What was the character of the alterations made by him? 2. How long from the writing of the first of the Old Testament to the last? 3. By whom were books added, and how frequently? 4. What did they teach? 5. Whom did they denounce? 6. What does this show? 7. How many books in the Old Testament? 8. How many had the ancient Jews? 9. The modern? 10. By whom was the Old Testament, in its present form, arranged? 11. Who reject the Apocrypha? Who are Protestants? 12. Who receive it as the word of God? 13. Why?

of their errors, regard it as of equal authority with the other scriptures, [1]only, however, since the council of Trent, in 1546. Some of the reasons for its rejection by Protestants, are the following: 1st. [2]It is not found in the Hebrew, which shows it to be of later origin than any part of the Old Testament, having been written since the Hebrew ceased to be spoken. 2d. [2]It was never received by the Jews or early christians. 3d. [2]It is not quoted by Christ or his apostles, whereas reference is made by them to all the books in the Bible, according to their division, except the Song of Solomon. 4th. [2]It contains statements that are absurd, and teaches doctrines contrary to the scriptures.

### LOST BOOKS.

We have in our copies of the Bible [3]all the books which were designed by the Holy Spirit to form a part of the sacred scriptures, though reference is made [4]to books which do not *appear* to be found. [5]The term "book," in scripture, simply means a writing, or rehearsal, and may contain a few lines or a whole history. [6]The book of "Samuel, the seer," 1 Chron. 29: 29, "Nathan, the prophet, and Gad, the seer," were simply rehearsals of particular events, and are included in the historical portions of

---

1. Have they always thus received it? 2. Why do Protestants reject it? 3. What have we in our copies of the Bible? 4. To what is reference made? 5. What is the meaning of "book," in scripture? 6. What is the character of the book of Samuel, the seer, Nathan, the prophet, and Gad, the seer, and where are they to be found?

Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. The mere mention of a book, or a quotation from it, is no proof that it was divinely inspired; for Paul, on three occasions, quotes from heathen writers. Aratus, Acts, 17: 28. Menander, 1 Cor. 15: 33. Epimenides, Tit. 1: 12. The book of the wars of the Lord, Num. 21: 14. The book of Jasher, Josh. 10: 13, were records of passing events, perhaps important at the time, but [1]being human productions, and never designed as a part of revelation, were not preserved. The three thousand proverbs, and one thousand and five songs of Solomon, and his history of plants and animals, though perhaps interesting and important productions, for the same reason have perished with the mass of uninspired writings of ancient times.

### SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

An event took place nine hundred and seventy-five years before Christ, which made it impossible to corrupt the law, had there been any disposition to do it, viz: [2]the revolt of the ten tribes under Jereboam, and the formation of [3]a distinct and hostile kingdom, denominated [4]Israel, whilst the remaining tribes, who adhered to the throne of David on which Rehoboam sat, were called [5]Judah.

---

1. Why has not the book of the wars of the Lord and of Jasher been preserved? 2. What event took place 975 B. C. which made it impossible to corrupt the pentateuch? 3 What was formed by this revolt? 4. By what name known? 5. What the nation that adhered to the throne of David?

[1]These nations were exceedingly hostile to each other, and had little or no intercourse ever after. "The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans," said the Samaritan woman to Christ. [2]Each nation, at the time of the division, possessed numerous copies of the Pentateuch, each held it in the highest reverence, and would, as their enemies assert, "sooner suffer death, than speak one word against it," or alter a single letter. And they could not have altered it had they been so disposed. [2]Had the Jews altered it, the ever jealous Samaritans had exposed them. [2]Had the Samaritans altered their scriptures, the Jews had exposed them. The fact that we have the Pentateuch as handed down to us by the Jews in one character, the Chaldee, and the same book handed down to us by their enemies, the Samaritans, in another character, the old Hebrew, after their having been separated nearly three thousand years, and with no important variation between them, in doctrine or precept, [3]is one of the strongest arguments that we have it, essentially, as it came from the hand of Moses. [4]The change in the names of places, and the record of the death of Moses at the end of his writings, were probably inserted by his successor, Joshua.

And that the rest of the books have been handed down to us as they came from their respective wri-

1. What were the feelings of these nations towards each other? 2. How did this tend to preserve the law? 3. What argument is furnished by the almost perfect agreement between the Samaritan and Hebrew Pentateuch? 4. What alterations have been made since it came from the hand of Moses?

ters, is strongly inferred from [1]the silence of our blessed Lord on that subject. Had the Jews been guilty of corrupting their scriptures, the Savior had most surely rebuked them for it. [2]He boldly charged them killing the prophets and stoning them that were sent unto them, and of misinterpreting, but never with corrupting or altering the word of God.

### SEPTUAGINT.

*Another* thing in its history furnishes a strong argument for the *uncorrupted preservation*, and the antiquity of the Hebrew scriptures, viz: [3]The Greek translation made [4]by seventy-two learned men, by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, [5]285 B. C., and called, therefore, [6]the Septuagint, or simply the LXX.

This translation was made after the Babylonish captivity, which lasted seventy years, and after the Hebrew language had ceased to be spoken or written, in any thing like its original purity, and was that used by Christ and his apostles, and from which their quotations were made. Being in Greek, the most important language on the globe, it was extensively circulated, and [7]among all nations where the Jews were scattered, was laid up [8]in public li-

1. What strong evidence that the rest of the books of the Old Testament have not been corrupted? 2. What did he charge them with? Is it not likely that he would have charged them with it, if they had altered it? (It is.) 3. What other circumstance furnishes evidence for the uncorrupted preservation of the Bible? 4. By how many men, and by whose orders was it made? 5. When? 6. What is it called? 7. Where was it circulated? 8. Where laid up and how preserved?

braries, and preserved as a sort of curiosity among heathen nations. The Hebrew scriptures could not, therefore, have been corrupted, or in the least degree altered, by friends or enemies, after this time, without its being exposed by a reference to this translation. [1]The present correspondence between the Septuagint and our Hebrew scriptures, evince the genuineness of the latter.

### NEW TESTAMENT.

The books of the New Testament are [2]twenty-seven in number, five historical, twenty-one epistolary, and the book of Revelation. Matthew was written [3]within six years of the ascension of Christ, and Mark within ten, by the men whose names they bear, and who were eye witnesses of what they relate. [4]Their books were extensively read and circulated, both among friends and enemies, [5]on the very spot where the miracles of Christ were said to be performed, and [6]whilst his enemies were still living, at a time when it had been an easy matter to have proved their statements false, if they had not been known to be true. As this was never attempted, even by the Jews, the most inveterate enemies of Christ, nor by infidels, the enemies of both, some of whom wrote most bitterly against Christ and

1. How can the Septuagint be used to prove the genuineness of the Hebrew scriptures? 2. How many books in the New Testamen? 3. When was Matthew's gospel written? 4. When written what was done with them? 5. Where? 6. When?

christians, we may reasonably conclude [1]that his miracles were really performed, and that the testimony of the evangelists is true.

All the books of the New Testament were written [2]within sixty-three years of the ascension of Christ. [3]No book is received as canonical, (of divine authority,) which was not written previous to the death of [4]the apostle John, who is generally understood to have given his sanction to all the books in the New Testament. The books of the New Testament are supposed, from good authority, to have been collected in one volume, though originally addressed to particular individuals, or churches, [5]within about eighty years of Christ's ascension, and during the first two centuries were well known [6]as the "Scriptures," the "Divine Scriptures," the "Oracles of the Lord," the "Gospels and Apostles," and the "New Testament."

No Synod convened to decide what were canonical. The scriptures do not depend upon the decision of the church for their authority. Yet the greatest caution was observed in giving countenance to any books claiming to come from the apostles. [7]The apostolic writings were immediately read in

---

1. As the Jews nor infidels never attempted to prove the statements of the apostles false, what do we infer? 2 Within what period were all the books of the New Testament written? 3. Were books written in the second or third century received as canonical? 4. Who is understood to have sanctioned all the books in the New Testament? 5. When were the books in the New Testament collected into one volume? 6 By what names was this volume known in the second century? 7. What was immediately done with the writings of the apostles?

the churches, hence little room was left to doubt their genuineness. [1]They were very soon attacked by the enemies of religion, who knew of their circulation, and ably and successfully defended [2]by the early fathers. From the attacks of these enemies the New Testament [3]gains some of the strongest arguments for its truth and early promulgation. [4]By them the evangelists are called by name within a hundred years of their death, and the prominent doctrines they thought, and the miracles performed by Christ mentioned, though not disputed. Celsus wrote his bitter attack [5]during the first century after the death of John. Porphyry, in the next century renews it. Julian, [6]an apostate from christianity, one of the most learned antagonists that the gospels have ever had, again takes it up fifty years later, and says, speaking of John, [7]"that neither Matthew nor Mark, nor Luke dared to call Jesus God," and that "none of Christ's disciples besides had ascribed to him the creation of the world."

That the contents of the several books of the New Testament are the same now that they were two hundred years after Christ, is evident [8]from the numerous quotations from them during the third and fourth centuries. So full are these quotations, and

1. Did their enemies know it? 2. By whom were they ably and successfully defended? 3. Did the New Testament gain or lose by these attacks? 4. How? 5. When did Celsus attack the gospels? 6. Who was Julian? 7. What does he say? Does not the testimony of Julian show that the early christians believed Jesus to be God? 8. How do you know that the books of the New Testament are the same in the second century?

so accurately made, that were the whole New Testament lost, [1]its place could be correctly supplied from the writings of the early fathers.

### SYRIAC VERSION.

[2]The New Testament was written in the [3]Greek language, which was then most generally spoken, though versions, or translations, were soon made into nearly all the languages of the east. One of the most important of these versions is the Syriac, made [4]in the language of Palestine, when christianity was there first established.

It was long supposed that no manuscripts of the word of life existed on the ground where Jesus and his apostles preached and suffered. After the art of printing was discovered, however, and a knowledge of the fact had extended to Palestine, [5]a bishop of Antioch sent a copy of the entire New Testament, excepting [6]the second epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Revelation, to Europe to be printed. [7]A number of Syriac MSS. have since been discovered, and the whole New and Old Testament obtained from the land where it was first written. One MS. obtained by Rev. Dr. Buchanan, is thought to have been written in [8]the seventh century. If so, it is the oldest MS. of

1. Suppose the New Testament were lost? 2. In what language was the New Testament written? 3. What language was most generally spoken? 4. In what language was the Syriac version made? 5. How was it ascertained that such an important version existed? 6. What parts were wanting? 7. What has been discovered since then? 8. What date has been assigned the MS. obtained by Dr. Buchanan?

which I have seen any notice. The majority are of a much later date.

### THE VULGATE, OR LATIN BIBLE.

*The Fulgate, or Latin* translation of the Holy Scriptures was made [1]during the first century of the christian era, [2]for the use of the Roman church, by [3]Jerome, [4]one of the most learned and laborious men of his day. He collected numerous versions and made a revised one, [5]390 A. D., and afterwards made a translation from the Hebrew, which at first was received with great reluctance, but on the recommendation of Gregory I. about 625 A. D., it became universally adopted by the Romish church, under the name of [6]the Vulgate version. [7]The council of Trent declared it authentic, including the Apocrypha, in the year 1546, A. D., and anathematized any who dared either to reject it or appeal to the Hebrew scriptures. [8]The Roman Catholics have, consequently, always used the Latin version, and have made all their translations from it. Whereas [9]Protestants make theirs from the original Hebrew.

The Vulgate became so corrupted during the dark ages, from the eighth to the thirteenth centu-

1. When was the Latin Vulgate made? 2. For whose use? 3. By whom? 4. What is said of him? 5. When was this translation made? 6. What version has been in common use in the Romish church? 7. What was done by the Council of Trent in 1546? 8. What version is used by the Roman Catholics at this time and from what do they make translations? 9. From what do Protestants make their translations?

ries, that numerous corrections were attempted. A revised edition was published by order of Pope Pius IV, and declared authentic, infallible, by Sextus V, 1590 A. D. Pope Gregory XIV, found it to be "swarming with errors," and suppressed it. Clement VIII, the successor of Gregory, published another edition, 1592 A. D., and pronounced it authentic, so that within three years [1]a church that claims she cannot err, pronounced two editions of the Bible infallible, and yet [2]more than two thousand discrepancies are found between them!!

GREAT NUMBER AND GENERAL AGREEMENT OF MSS.

[4]More than eleven hundred and fifty MSS. of the whole, or parts, of the Old Testament in the Hebrew language, and seven hundred and fifty of the New Testament in the Greek language, have been collected and compared. These MSS. have been obtained [5]from almost all parts of the globe, copied and preserved by nations unknown to each other. Some of them have been separated, and held as most sacred treasures [6]for nearly three thousand years, and yet when [7]they come together, from nations who could not speak each others language, and knew not of each others existence, they are easily identified as [8]copies of the same work.

1. What was done by a church that claims she cannot err, within three years? 2. Were there no errors in this work which the church declared without error? 3. Does this prove that church infallible or fallible? 4. How many MSS. of the Old, and how many of the New Testament, have been collected and compared? 5. Where have they been obtained? 6. How long have they been separated? 7. Did these different nations know of the existence of these MSS. 8. What [redacted] these 1900 MSS. readily identified as being?

Whereever the Bible is found [1] they have for it the greatest veneration; [2] millions in every age have preserved it as their choicest treasure—as their title-deed to an eternal inheritance. [3] When commanded, as has frequently been the case, by emperors and popes to surrender it to be burned, they have given *themselves* up to the flames, rather than their Bibles. [4] No book on earth has been kept with one ten-thousandth part of the care. Hence all other writings, whose date would correspond to the time when the Old Testament, and especially the Pentateuch, was written, [5] have long since perished.

With an immese amount of labor and expense, the burning sands of Africa have been traversed, and the interior of Asia explored to find MSS. of the word of God, and to gain any intelligence that would throw light upon them. [6] Thousands of the friends of revelation have spent their whole lives in transcribing, or comparing different MSS., marking the least or most minute variation. [7] One thousand nine hundred different MSS. of the whole, or parts, of the sacred writings, from almost every nation, have been deciphered and compared. And wonderful to tell, as it shows that these writings have been kept of God, [8] all the omissions and variations in the different MSS.

---

1. Do these different and unknown nations all prize this book? 2. What have millions regarded it? 3. Would they give it up to be burned? 4. Has it been kept with care? 5. What has become of those books made five or six hundred years before Christ? Can you tell why the Bible has outlived them all? 6. What have the friends of revelation done? 7. How many MSS. have been deciphered? Is it much labor to read one MS.? 8 How do these MSS. agree? Can we have a stronger proof that we have the uncorrupted word of God?

put together, do not affect the sense so as to countenance the omission of a single truth; and all the additions and variations of all the MSS. put together, if they were all received, would not introduce a single essential error. Some pretenders to learning talk much about the "various readings." The testimony of those, however, whose lives have been spent in the examination of these readings is, "that the worst manuscripts extant would not pervert one article of our faith, or destroy one moral precept, not elsewhere given in the most explicit terms."

### ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS.

The venerable Bede, [1] in the beginning of the eighth century, made the first attempt to translate the Bible into the Anglo Saxon, or rude German English. He translated the Psalms and the Gospels and died as he completed the last chapter. Alfred the Great, king of England, also translated the Psalms in the latter part of the same century.

For more than five hundred years, [2] during the exclusive reign of Popery, the Bible lay neglected, in the orignal languages, few were able to purchase or read it. Previous to the discovery of the art of printing, a copy of the Bible fairly written out, would cost [3] one hundred and fifty dollars!

The first translation of the entire Bible in the Eng-

1. When and by whom was the first attempt made to render the Bible into English? 2. When was the Bible almost entirely neglected? 3. What was the expense of a Bible in the fourteenth century?

lish language, was made [1]by John Wickliffe, 1360. And though never printed, [2]it did much towards preparing the way for the reformation, and greatly exasperated [3]the Catholic clergy, who forty years after his death, caused his bones to be disinterred and burned, and their ashes cast into the river. Henry V. passed a law [4]declaring those who read or possessed Wickliffe's books, guilty of treason. [5]Multitudes suffered martyrdom in consequence of this law.

[6]William Tyndal published the first printed *New Testament* in the English language, in the year 1546, about eighty-five years after the [7]art of printing was discovered. [8]A few years after, he, assisted by some others, printed portions of the Old Testament in France, where [9]he was arrested as a heretic, strangled and burnt. [10]The Catholic clergy greatly opposed the translation of the Book of Life into the language of the common people. [11]Bishop Tonstal, in order to prevent the circulation of Tyndal's Testament in England, purchased and burned all the copies he could procure. But God caused the wrath of this man to praise him. For when it was likely to crush the publishers, the means were thus procured, though undesignedly, for printing a new

1. When was the whole Bible first translated, and by whom? 2. What effect did it produce? 3. What did the Catholics do to his bones forty years after he was dead? 4. What law was enacted by Henry V.? 5. What was the consequence? 6. By whom, and where, was the first New Testament printed? 7. When was the art of printing discovered? (1441.) 8. When and where did Tyndal and others print portions of the Old Testament? 9. What became of him? 10. Who opposed the translation of the Bible? 11. How did bishop Tonstal undesignedly further the publishing of the Bible?

and more enlarged edition, which could be sold at a cheaper rate.

Cardinal Woolsey declared against the art of printing [1]as that which would take down the honor and profit of the priesthood, by making the people as wise as themselves. A copy of the Bible found in the possession of any one was sufficient to condemn him to the flames.

The first printed translation of the entire English Bible, was made [2]from the Latin and German, by Miles Coverdale, and dedicated to king Henry VIII, 1535, and was allowed to be circulated by royal authority. [3]Arch-Bishop Cranmer, assisted by numerous learned men, made a new translation, by permission of Henry VIII, which was printed in Paris, 1538. [4]A large share of this edition was seized and burned by the Inquisition, and the proprietors compelled to flee from France. [5]The Bishop's Bible, and several other translations were made, about this period; a strong desire was manifested to possess and read the word of God. I shall only notice

### OUR PRESENT VERSION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

This was first published in [6]1610, by order of [7]king James I, in consequence of serious objections having been made to all the English translations of

1. As what did Cardinal Woolsey declare against the art of printing? 2. From what, by whom, and when was the first printed translation of the entire English Bible made? 3. Who made a new translation from the original? 4. What became of a large share of the edition? 5. Were any other translations made about this time? 6. When was our present translation of the Bible made? 7. By whose orders?

the Bible, as not fairly giving the sense of the original. It was his aim [1]to furnish one that should be deserving of universal confidence. For this purpose [2]fifty-four of the most learned men in his realm were selected—[3]men who were skilled in the Hebrew and Greek not only, but in all the oriental languages, and who were acquainted with the manners and customs of the East. For some cause seven of these men never entered upon the work. The remaining [4]forty-seven were divided [5]into six classes, and different portions of the Hebrew or Greek scriptures were assigned to each class for translation. They then proceeded to the work according to the regulations of the king, which required the greatest care in giving the sense.

[6]Each man was required to translate by himself the whole portion assigned to all the class. This would make almost eight translations of every portion assigned. [7]Then the whole class were to assemble and compare their translations, and agree as to the one to be adopted. Then the whole six sets assembled and reviewed and corrected the portions assigned to each particular class. [9]To avoid the possibility of any words being wrongly interpreted, one man read aloud his translation and all the rest

1. As objections had been made to all previous translations, what was his aim? 2. How many men did he select for this purpose? 3. Were they competent to the undertaking? 4. How many actually engaged in the work? 5. How were they divided? What was assigned them? 6. What was each man required to do? 7. What was then done? 8. To be more certain still that it is accurate, how was it reviewed? 9. How did they proceed in reviewing it?

held copies of the portion read in their hands in different languages. [1]If any question arose, or any fault was discovered by any one of the whole number, the reader was arrested until all were satisfied that the best possible word or phrase was adopted.

[2]So accurate was this translation, and so much superior to any other, that in a short time it was universally received. [3]For more than two hundred years all denominations of christians acknowledged that it was the best, most correct and judicious translation that could be made. The most learned men have given it their sanction and recommendation, as giving the true sense of the original, whereever the words have been translated. And every word is translated, [4]so far as it can be rendered in our language without a circumlocution. But if, as some of the modern opponents of this translation affirm, some words are merely transferred, [5]one denomination stands on equally fair grounds with another.

[6]Our language is made up of others. [7]Many words, in reading Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, cannot be translated without using words just as little our own, as the original word englicised. For example, the Greek word (angelos) meaning angel, or messenger. Angel is Greek englicised. Messenger is

---

1. How were questions settled? 2. How came this translation to be so soon and so generally adopted? 3. How did all denominations of christians regard it for more than two hundred years? 4. Are all the words translated? 5. Suppose some words were merely transferred, would any one denomination have the advantage? 6. Of what is our language made up? 7. Can all words be translated without a circumlocution?

French, with an English termination. Bapto and Baptizo are Greek words, and mean in the New Testament generally, and in the Septuagint, to cleanse, or purify, and often refers to a ceremonial purifying. The Jews performed this ceremonial purifying when they returned from the markets, and is called baptizing. The orignal englicised is as intelligible, and more so, than any translation. If we translate the Greek Baptizo *immerse*, we merely substitute a Latin word, (immergo,) englicised, instead of the Greek, englicised, without selecting a word that gives the sense.

Our present translation is the best that has ever been made, and gives the sense as correctly as it can be given, and may be relied upon with the fullest confidence. And when men have much fault to find with the Bible as it is translated, it is because [1]they have views to support which the sacred volume does not warrant.

### [2]DOURAY BIBLE.

This is an English translation, made [3]from the Latin Vulgate instead of the Hebrew, and is the Bible used by the Roman Catholics. [4]It contains many Apocryphal books which we reject, some additional words and sentences, and has left out some words and sentences contained in the Hebrew and

---

1. What men find much fault with our present translation? 2. What is the name of the Bible used by the Roman Catholics? 3. From what is it made? 4. Wherein does it differ from ours?

Greek scriptures, and numerous words are translated in accordance with their particular views. [1]It was published in 1609, in consequence of the urgent demand among the laity for the scriptures, and to counteract the influence of Protestant versions. They acknowledged that they were forced to this work.

---

FACTS FOR THE CURIOUS.

[2]The heading to the chapters in our Bibles is not in the original, and forms no part of the scriptures. [2]The subscription at the close of some of the books, though in the Greek, was not written by the apostles, nor until long after their day. The several books were originally written [3]in one continued series, with the words all joined together, and many MSS. are written all in capital letters. Different divisions of the scriptures had been made from the fourth century, but the present division into chapters was made [4]by Cardinal Hugo, 1240. And the division into verses [5]by Robert Stevens, 1551. Punctuation was unknown in the fourth century, and not generally adopted until the [5]ninth. The Jews were so exact in copying that they counted all the letters, and every copy must have just so many, and so many on every page. This, with

1. When and why published? Are the titles to the chapters, or the subscription at the end of books any part of the Bible? 3. How were the scriptures originally written? 4. When and by whom divided into chapters? 5. By whom and when into verses? 6. When was the punctuation generally introduced?

them, was the more readily done as they had no vowels in their language.

There are in the Bible, 39 books in the Old, and 27 in the New Testament. Total, 66

929 chapters in the Old, and 260 in the New Testament. Total, 1,189

23,214 verses in the Old, and 7,959 in the New Testament. Total, 31,173

592,439 words in the Old, and 181,253 in the New Testament. Total, 773,692

The middle chapter, and the least, is Ps. 117.

The middle verse is the 8th of 118th Psalm.

The word Jehovah occurs 6,856 times.

The middle chapter in the Old Testament, is the 29th of Job.

The middle chapter in the New Testament, is between the 13th and 14th of Romans.

The shortest verse in the New Testament, is John, 11:35.

The 21st verse of the 7th chapter of Ezra, has all the letters of the alphabet in it except j.

The 19th of 2 Kings, and 37th of Isaiah, are alike.

The whole Bible may be read through in one year, by reading three chapters a day and five on the sabbath.

SUMMARY

# CONFESSION OF FAITH,

AND FORM OF

# COVENANT.

Adopted by the Presbytery of GENEVA, and recommended to the Churches under their care.

---

## CONFESSION OF FAITH.

ART. I.—YOU BELIEVE, That there is one God, (a) who is infinitely perfect, (b) and is the CREATOR, (c) PRESERVER, (d) and GOVERNOR of all things; (e) That this one GOD exists mysteriously in three persons, (f) the FATHER, the SON, (h) and the HOLY GHOST, (i) who are the same in substance, and equal in all perfections. (j)

ART. II.—That the SCRIPTURES of the OLD and NEW TESTAMENT are the Word of God, (k) and are the only rule of faith and practice. (l)

ART. III.—That our first parents were made perfectly holy; (m) but, by disobedience, fell from the

---

(a) 1 Cor. 8: 4. Deut. 4: 39. (b) Deut. 32: 4. Ps. 147: 5. Rom. 11: 33. (c) Gen. 1. Col. 1: 16. (d) Neh. 9: 6. Job, 12: 10. Heb. 1: 3. (e) Ps. 22: 28. Dan. 4: 34, 35. Rom. 11: 36. (f) 1 Jn. 5: 7. (g) Jn. 5: 18, 27. (h) Heb. 1: 8. (i) Acts, 5: 3, 4. (j) Jn. 1: 1–3, 14, and 14: 9–11, and 10: 30. Mat. 28: 19. 2 Cor. 13: 14. (k) 2 Tim. 3: 16. 2 Pet. 1: 21. 1 Thess. 2: 13. (l) Jn. 5: 39. Rom. 15: 4. Gal. 1: 8. (m) Gen. 1: 27. Eph. 4: 24

state in which they were created; (n) in consequence of which all their posterity are, by nature, *entirely* sinful. (o)

ART. IV.—That GOD, in his infinite and sovereign mercy, has provided a SAVIOR, even JESUS CHRIST, his dearly beloved SON, (p) who having become incarnate, (q) by his *obedience*, honored the law, (r) and by his *death* made a *complete atonement* for sin; (s) so that, *all* who believe in HIM obtain the forgiveness of their sins, and a sure title to eternal life. (t)

ART. V.—That salvation is *freely offered* to *all*: (u) but that all mankind are naturally so *depraved*, and such perfect enemies to GOD and the SAVIOR, (v) that no one will repent of sin and believe in CHRIST (w) until GOD, according to his eternal purpose, (x) give him a new heart, by the sovereign and efficacious influences of his HOLY SPIRIT. (y)

ART. VI.—That all *true believers* persevere in faith and holiness, being kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. (z)

ART. VII.—That the LAW of GOD, which re-

---

(n) Gen. 2: 17, and 3: 6, 24. (o) Rom. 5: 12, 15–19, and 3: 23. Jer. 17: 9. (p) Gal. 4: 4, 5. Jn. 4: 9, 10. (q) Jn. 1: 14. 1 Tim: 3: 16. (r) Isa. 42: 21. Phil. 2: 8. (s) 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6. Heb. 2: 9. 1 Jn. 2: 2. (t) Acts, 16: 31, and 5: 31. Jn. 5: 24, and 6: 40. (u) Isa. 45: 22. Mark, 16: 15. Jn. 7: 37. Isa. 55. 1. Rev. 22, 17. (v) Gen. 6: 5. Rom. 3: 9, 18. Eph. 2: 1, 3. James, 4: 4. Luke, 19: 14. Jn. 15: 18, 23–25. (w) Math. 22: 3–6. Jn. 3: 19, 20, and 5: 40, 44, and 6, 44, 65. (x) Rom. 8: 28–30. Eph. 1: 4, 5, 9, 11, and 2: 10, and 3: 10, 11. 2 Tim. 1: 9. Jn. 15: 16. Acts, 13: 48. (y) Ezek. 36: 26, 27. Jn. 3: 5, 6, and 6: 63, 65, and 1: 13. (z) Jn. 10: 27, 2, 9.

quires perfect holiness of heart and life, (aa) is the rule which christians are bound to observe. (bb)

ART. VIII—That *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*, are *Christian ordinances;* (cc) the latter of which is to be administered to professing believers; (dd) and the former to them, and to their *households*. (ee)

ART. IX—That at the end of the world, there will be a *Resurrection* of *the bodies* of all mankind, (ff) and a day of *Judgment*; (gg) when *Christ*, the *Judge* (hh) will sentence the wicked to endless punishment, (ii) and receive the righteous to life everlasting. (jj)

---

## COVENANT.

Sensible of our dependence on God, (a) and infinite obligation to live to his glory, (b) we do publicly, in the presence of angels and men, covenant to be the *Lord's*.

---

1 Pet. 1: 3, 5. Phil. 1: 6. Rom. 8: 29, 30, 38, 39. (aa) Gen. 17: 1. 1 Pet. 1. 15, 16. Math. 22: 37, 40. (bb) Josh. 1: 8. Math, 5: 17, 19. Rom. 7: 12. 2 Cor. 7: 1. James. 2: 10. 2 Pet. 1: 19–21. 1 Jn. 3: 4, 2. Jn. 4: 11. (cc) Acts. 2: 38. Math. 28: 19. 1 Cor. 11: 23, 26. (dd) 1 Cor. 11: 27–29. (ee) Acts, 8: 37, and 2: 38, 39, and 16: 15, 33. 1 Cor. 1: 16. (ff) Acts, 24: 15. Jn. 5: 28, 29. 1 Cor. 15. (gg) Eccl. 12: 14. Math. 12: 36. Acts, 17: 31 Heb. 9: 27. 2 Pet. 3: 7. Jude, 14: 15. Dan. 7: 9, 10. Rev. 20: 12, 15. (hh) 2 Cor. 5: 10. Math. 25: 31, 32. Jn, 5: 22. (ii) Job, 21: 25, 30. Ps. 9: 17. Dan. 12: 2. Math. 13: 49, 50, and 25: 41, 46.—Mark, 9: 43, 44. 2 Thess. 1: 7, 9. Jude, 7. Rev. 14: 10, 11. (jj) Dan. 12: 2. Gal. 6, 8. Math. 25: 34, 46, and 13: 43.

(a) Acts, 17: 28. For in him we live and move and have our being. Ps. 127: 1, 2. Isa. 64: 8. Jer. 18: 6. Rom. 9: 21. (b) 1 Cor. 6: 19, 20. Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are Gods'. 1 Cor. 10: 31. Ps. 29: 2, and 115. 1 Isa. 42: 8. Dan. 5: 23. Math. 2: 2. Math. 5: 16. Luke, 2: 14. Jn. 12: 28, and 13: 31, 32, and 17: 4, and 15: 8, and 21: 19. Acts' 12: 23. Rom. 1: 21, and 3: 23. Gal. 1: 24. 1 Pet. 4: 11. Rev. 4: 11.—

(c) We solemnly avouch (d) *Jehovah, Father, Son* and *Holy Ghost,* to be our *God,* our *Redeemer,* and *Sanctifier.* We freely give ourselves and all we have to him. (e) We take the word of God as our only rule of faith and practice. (f) We do solemnly engage, by divine grace assisting, to lead a life of piety towards God, and uprightness towards man. (g)

We promise to maintain *closet* (h) and *family* (i) prayer, morning and evening, (j) to remember the *Sabbath day* to keep it holy, (k) constantly on God's holy day to attend on public worship, (l) to *dedicate our households* to God in baptism, (m) and

---

(c) Jer. 50: 5. They shall ask their way to Zion with their faces thitherward, saying, come and let us join ourselves to the Lord, in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten. Math. 10: 32, 33. Luke, 12, 8, 9.—Chron. 15: 12. Ps. 50: 5. (d) Deut. 26: 17. Thou hast avouched the Lord this day, to be thy God, &c. Heb 10: 29, 31. Ps. 50: 16, 17, and 76: 11, and 116: 14, 18. Eccl. 5: 4, 5. (e) Rom. 12: 1. I beseech you therefore brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. Acts, 4: 32. Rom. 6: 19. [f] 2 Tim. 3: 16. Rev. 22: 18, 19. Heb. 1: 1. (g) Micah. 6: 8. He hath showed thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk, humbly with thy God? Eccl. 12: 13. Math. 22: 37, 39. (h) Math. 6: 6. But thou when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret.

(i) Jer. 10: 25. Pour out thy fury upon the heathen, that know thee not, and upon the families that call not on thy name. Dan. 6: 10. 2 Sam. 2: 20. Acts, 10: 2, 30. Eph. 6: 18. (j) Ex. 29: 38, 39. Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar, two lambs of the first year, day by day continually. The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning, and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even. When they offered sacrifice they prayed. 2 Chron. 7: 1. Dan. 9: 21. This shows that evening was a time, when they called upon God. Job. 1: 5, is an example for morning prayer. Daniel prayed with his family, not only at evening, but three times a day. Dan. 6: 10. See also what the Psalmist says, Ps. 55: 17. Is it not evident, from these passages, that we ought to pray at least as often as morning and evening? (k) Gen. 2: 3. Ex. 20: 8. Math. 24: 20. (l) Lev. 23. 3. Six days shall work be done, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, and holy convocation, [calling together.] Ye shall do no work therein; it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings. Agreeably to this command, the primitive christians constantly assembled on the first day of the week.—Acts, 20: 7. Heb. 10: 15. (m) Acts, 16: 33. 1 Cor. 7: 14. Acts, 2: 39.

restrain them from all sinful amusements, (n) and train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord : (o)

Also to attend upon the Lord's Supper, (p) when it shall be administered in the church. We also covenant as members of the church, to watch over one another, (g) to be tender of each other's character, (r) kindly to admonish and receive admonitions, (s) to confess our faults one to another, (t) and restore in the spirit of meekness those who give evidence of their repentance. (u) We mutually agree to maintain the discipline of a gospel church, (v) to support the gospel ministry, (w) and to encourage and promote in all places, and in all proper ways, the preaching of the doctrines contained in the foregoing articles of faith, and all the doctrines, duties and precepts of the divine word. (x)

Thus we solemnly promise and covenant to walk, live and conduct; (y) depending on God the Father

---

Mark, 10: 14, compared with Math. 19: 13, 14, and Luke, 18: 15, 16. (n) Job, 21: 7–15. Amos, 5: 23, and 6: 4–6. Rom. 13: 13, 14. 1 Sam. 3: 11–13, 1 Cor. 10: 31. (o) Eph. 6: 4. Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Gen. 18: 19. Deut, 4: 9, 10, and 5: 29, and 6: 7.—Ps. 78: 4–7, and 103: 17, 18. Prov. 27: 6. Is. 44: 3, & 61: 8, 9, and 65: 23. (p) Luke, 22: 19, 20. 1 Cor. 11: 26, 28. (q) Math. 18. Heb. 3: 12, 13. (r) Ps. 50: 20, and 101: 5. Prov. 11: 13, and 18: 8, and 20: 19, and 26: 22.—Rom. 13: 10. (s) Ps. 141, 5. Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness, and let him reprove me, it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head. Lev. 19: 17. Luke, 7: 3. (t) James 5: 16. Confess your faults, one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.—Prov. 28: 13. (u) Gal. 6: 1. Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Luke, 17: 3, 4. (v) Math. 18: 15–17. Tit. 3: 10. 1 Thes. 5: 14. (w) Gal. 6: 6. Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things. Neh. 13: 10. Math. 3: 8–10. 1 Cor. 9: 14. Luke 10: 7. 1 Tim. 5: 18. (x) Gal. 1: 6–9. 2 Jn. 10: 11. (y) Neh. 10: 28–31, 2 Chron. 16: 15–17. Ps. 56: 11, 12.

for strength; Jesus the Redeemer for grace to help; the Holy Ghost our sanctifier and comforter, to guide us unto truth. (z)

And may God be with and make us faithful in this world, and at last receive us, with all the redeemed, to himself in glory.

---

(z) Ps. 97: 3–5, and 62: 8, and 115: 9–11, and 118: 8, 9, and 12: 5, 1, 2. Isa. 40: 31, and 50: 10. Neh. 1, 7. Hab. 3: 17, 18. 2 Cor. 12: 9. Eph. 4: 7. 2 Tim. 2: 1, 1 Jn. 2: 1. 1 Thess. 2: 13. 1 Pet. 1: 2. Jn. 14: 16, 17, 26, and 16: 7–13. 2 Cor. 13, 14.

THE

# DOCTRINES OF THE BIBLE

## EXPLAINED AND PROVED.

---

The foregoing articles, it is thought, contain [1] the summary of all the essential doctrines of grace, as believed by the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Dutch Reformed churches. [2] Their Summaries are not all worded alike, yet they are substantially the same. The vindication of one is the vindication of them all. Most of the articles, however, are such as are believed by all evangelical churches. Every member of a church should be familiar with its doctrinal views, and be able [3] not only to affirm *what* he believes, but *why* he believes it. He should be rooted and grounded in the truth, not "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Eph. 4: 14.

[4] *Truth* is the instrumental cause of our sanctification. The more we know of the truth, the more

---

1. What do the foregoing articles contain? 2. Are their summaries alike? 3. What should every church member be able to do? 4. What the instru-

rapidly will our sanctification progress. [1]Hence, our Savior prayed, "sanctify them *through* thy truth, thy word is truth." John, 17 : 17.

[2]The high standard of piety among our Puritan fathers, is, to a very great extent, to be attributed to their clear understanding of the Bible. [3]Doctrines are the frame-work of religion, and [4]he who has been indoctrinated when a child, will be much more likely to become a christian not only, but will, other things being equal, be a much more stable, consistent, and useful christian.

---

## ARTICLE I.

God's Existence — Unity — Perfection — Government. — The Trinity.

### [5]THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

[6]All that ever savingly come to God, must believe, "that he *is*, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. 11: 6. Among the arguments to prove the existence of God, are the following :

1. [7]*All nations unite in the belief of a Supreme Creator and Governor.* No nation of atheists, as those who deny the existence of God are called, has ever been found. [8]The eternal Creator has en-

---

ment of our sanctification? 1. What was our Savior's prayer? 2. To what is the high standard of piety among our Puritan Fathers to be attributed? 3. What are doctrines said to be? 4. What advantages arise from being early indoctrinated? 5. What is the first article of faith? 6. What must all who come to God believe? 7. What is the first argument used to prove the existence of God? 8. How came that idea so general?

stamped the idea of his own existence so indellibly upon the mind, that even depravity itself, though it would, cannot efface it. "The fool hath said in his *heart* there is no God." Ps. 14: 1. His inordiate passions prompt him to wish there were none, though his understanding rebukes him for it.—The force of this argument is here. [1]What all men so generally believe, though living in different ages of the world, and in different parts, and having no intercourse with each other, we have strong reason to think true, as it shows that they must all have learned it from the same GREAT SPIRIT.

2. [2]*As something now exists, something must have existed from eternity.* And [3]it is more rational to suppose that an intelligent, all powerful Being, like God, existed from eternity, than to suppose that the changing objects which we see, existed from eternity. Besides, to suppose that the world with its changes has existed from eternity, is to suppose that there has been eternal changes, without any beginning to any of them; but, [4]every change that we see, has a beginning, and a change without a beginning, is as impossible as a chain with but one end.

3. [5]*Every effect requires an adequate cause.* Were an atheist to find a most magnificent man-

---

1. Wherein lies the force of this argument? 2. What is the second argument for the existence of God? 3. Which is the most rational to suppose, that constantly changing matter, or an unchangeable and infinitely perfect God existed from eternity? 4. Can there be a change without a beginning to change? 5. What is the third argument for the existence of God?—

sion splendidly furnished, ten thousand miles from the abodes of men, he at once would say that some human intelligence had been employed there. And [1]no argument would make him believe that it was the work of chance, or of brutes. His mind demands an adequate,—a rational cause. A more magnificent edifice stands out before us,—[2]*The universe of God*,—demanding an adequate cause. I think it was Sir Isaac Newton who showed the folly of atheism to his friend an atheist, [3]by placing a finely executed artificial globe in a room into which his friend was introduced, who immediately inquired where it was made?—Sir Isaac avowed that it was not made, but came into the room by chance. The atheist stared and almost became angry at such an insult to his understanding, when Sir Isaac called his attention to the inconsistency of his affirming that the mighty universe, with its countless worlds, was the work of chance, whilst he was unwilling to allow it possible that so faint a resemblance of the smallest part of it, could have originated in the same manner.

4. [4]*From the evident marks of design, we infer a designer*. The eye was evidently designed to see with, the ear to hear with. [5]*Adaptation* pervades, so far as we can discover, the universe of God.—

---

1. Could you convince an atheist that a house far from the abodes of men had built itself, or that chance built it?
2. What more stupendous edifice do we behold asking for an adequate cause? 3. How did Sir Isaac Newton show the absurdity of atheism?
4. What is the fourth argument? 5 What law pervades God's universe?

Fish are adapted to the water,—fowls to the air—every animal to its respective pursuit. Plants and animals, with most evident design, are adapted to propagate their species.

5. [1] *The performance of miracles*, if it be proved, is evidence of a superior power.

6. [2] *The fulfillment of prophecy* shows the existence of a God and a Governor. [3] None but He who created and governs could foretell any event with certainty.

7. [4] *The existence of conscience*, which terrifies and alarms guilty men, even when their guilt is unknown to others, or could not be punished if known, proves the existence of God. [5] "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work." Ps. 19: 1. [5] "Every *house* is builded by some *man;* but he that built *all things is God*." Heb. 3: 4.

## UNITY OF GOD.

This is proved, 1. *From* [6] *the unity of design running through all the works of the Creator.* The general harmony of what are termed the laws of nature, evinces the action of but one supreme agent. 2. *From* [7] *our very idea of God*, viz. [8] a being than

---

1. What is the fifth argument? 2. What the sixth? 3. Who alone can foretell events? 4. What the seventh argument? 5. What scriptures are quoted? 6. What is the first argument to prove God's unity? 7. The second? 8. What is our idea of God?

whom we can conceive of none more perfect, or greater. [1]He is infinite in every perfection, and [2]two absolutely infinite beings cannot be conceived to exist; and any thing short of infinite cannot be God; and any being *less* than infinite, must be under the control of the infinite.

3. *The scriptures* assert the unity of God.—[3]"Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is *one* Lord." Deut. 6: 4. [3]"There is none other God but *one*." 1 Cor. 8: 4. [3]"There is *one* God, and *one* mediator." 1 Tim. 2: 5. [3]"I am the first and the last, and besides me there is no God." Isa. 44: 6.

### THE PERFECTIONS OF GOD,

Are commonly regarded as [4]*natural* and *moral*. The natural perfections or attributes of God, are [5]those which do not exhibit his character as holy or sinful, as [6]*Spirituality, Immensity, Immutability, Eternity, Independence or Self-existence, Omniscience* and *Omnipotence*.

[7]The moral attributes of God, bring to view his moral character, and exhibit his holy nature, as [8]*Benevolence, Justice, Mercy, Grace* and *Truth*, and *Wisdom*. [9]The combination of all these attri-

---

1. How perfect must God be? 2. Can two infinitely perfect beings exist? 3. What scripture prove the unity of God? 4. How are the attributes of God divided? 5. What do you mean by the natural attributes of God? 6. Which are they? 7. What by the moral? 8. Which are they?—9. What is holiness?

butes is *Holiness*, which leads him to consecrate all the elements of his being to the best good of his immense empire.

[1]By the *spirituality* of God, is meant, that he is an immaterial substance, without flesh, or blood, or bones, and without bodily parts; and when in the scriptures, eyes, and ears, and mouth, and hands, and feet, &c., are ascribed to God, language is used [2]figuratively, so that we can the more easily conceive of him. "A spirit," says Christ, "hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Luke, 24: 39. [3]"God is a spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth." [4]"God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." John, 4: 24.

*By the immensity of God*, is meant, [5]His unlimited greatness,—his being without measure, bounds or limits,—the infinite expansion of all his attributes so that our conceptions cannot extend to a more perfect being, in any respect. Hence, he is *incomprehensible*, [6]in his being, in his works, and in his providences. "Canst thou by searching, find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" Job, 11: 7. The immensity of God em-

---

1. What is meant by the spirituality of God?
2. When eyes, and ears, and feet, &c., are applied to God, in the scriptures, how is language used? 3. What kind of a spirit is God? 4. How is God to be worshipped? 5. What is meant by the immensity of God?—6 In what respects is God incomprehensible?

braces [1]his *omnipresence*,—[2]his filling heaven and earth at the same time. Though God does not equally manifest himself, he is equally present at all times, and in all places. He is never absent from any part of his dominions, and none of his creatures can escape the notice of his eye. [3]"Whither shall I go from thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.—If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me.—Yea the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day; the darkness and the light are both alike to thee." Ps. 139: 7, 12.

By the *immutability* of God, is meant, [4]his unchangeableness. This, in an absolute sense, belongs to no other being. God alone is unchanging. He is never sorry—never repents. [5]When in scripture he is said to repent—to be sorry—grieved at heart, &c., language is used as men use it, and means simply that God *acts* as man would act did he repent, was he sorry or grieved. When God destroyed the earth with a flood, he *acted* as though he was

1. What besides incomprehensibility does the immensity of God embrace? 2. What is meant by his omnipotence? 3. What scripture proves the omnipresence of God? 4. What is meant by the immutability of God? 5. How do you explain those portions of scripture which speak of God's re-

sorry he had made it. When he spared Nineveh on its repentance, he repented him of the evil which he thought to do to it. He acted as though he had never meant any evil to it. So far from changing in any respect is God, that [1]"with him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." James, 1: 17, [1]"God is not a man that he should lie, or the Son of man, that he should repent." Num. 23: 19.—[1]"Whatsoever God does, it shall be forever." Eccl. 3: 14.

The *eternity* of God is [2]his being without beginning and without end. Eternity belongs to God alone. [3]Other beings may be everlasting, as angels and saints, but God is *from* everlasting *to* everlasting. Ps. 90: 2, without *succession* or *change*.—Events do not pass before God's mind one after another in succession, as they do with us. It is all present.

[4]By the *independence* or *self-existence* of God is meant that he exists in and of himself, without depending upon any other being, either for existence, preservation or any enjoyment. His perfections are underived. [5]He exists from eternity to eternity,—was never created, nor did he spring into being by chance, but is self existent. His *knowledge* is from himself. [6]He never has received a sin-

---

penting, being sorry, &c.? 1. What scripture proves that God is unchangeable, and cannot repent? 2. What do you mean by the eternity of God?—3. What is said of other beings?

4. What is meant by the independence or self-existence of God? 5. How long has God been in existence?

6. Has he received any accessions to his knowledge, power, or happiness?

gle new idea, nor does he receive power from any one. His happiness is from himself, and cannot be increased or diminished. "If thou sinnest, what doest thou against him, or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receiveth he of thy hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit the Son of man." Job, 35: 6–8, but neither will affect God. [1]God is the only independent existence in the universe, all other beings depend upon him. He alone acts, wills, and chooses without any restraint or constraint, from any source. [2]A dependent (as man certainly is) independence is a gross absurdity.

[3]God's *omniscience* is his knowing *all* things, which we call past, present, and future, with a perfect knowledge. He sees it all at one glance. There is no conceivable bounds, or limits, to the knowledge of God. He is as well acquainted with every insect, and every atom, as though it were the only object in existence. "His understanding is infinite." [4]He scrutinizes every act of each of his intelligences as closely, as though but one act were being performed; nothing diverts his attention, nor can it be taken off of one object to be placed upon another.

---

1. Who alone is absolutely independent? 2. Can there be a dependent independence? Is man independent? 3. What is meant by God's omniscience? 4. How closely does he scrutinize every act of each of his creatures?

By the *omnipotence* of God, is meant his almighty power—his ability to do whatever he sees best. It is seen, 1. in *Creation*; 2. in *Preserving* and *Governing*; 3. in *Redemption*; 4. in *the conversion of sinners*, and the final salvation of the righteous; 5. *in the everlasting punishment* of the wicked; 6. in the *Resurrection* of the bodies of men at the end of the world.

[1]The *benevolence* of God, is his wishing well to all his creatures. [2]To secure the greatest conceivable amount of happiness to all the subjects of his immense empire, and to all orders of existence, the high and holy attributes of Jehovah are consecrated. [3]Another name for this attribute is *love*, which in fact embraces all God's attributes. "*God is love, God is love,*" is twice affirmed in one chapter. 1 John, 4: 8, 16. The benevolence of God is seen, 1. [4]In the multiplicity of animated existence which he has formed. Every drop of water, every grain of sand, and every leaf of the forest, are peopled with happy beings. 2. [4]From the bountiful provisions which he has made, to supply their respective wants. "The eyes of all wait upon thee," says the pious psalmist, "and thou givest them their meat in due season." "That thou givest them, they gather:" Ps. 145: 15, and 104: 28. 3. [4]In his patience and forbearance towards the wicked, who habitually dis-

1. What is meant by God's benevolence? 2. To what great object are the attributes of God consecrated? 3. What other name for benevolence? 4. In what do you discover God's benevolence?

pise his mercy. 4. [4] In giving his beloved son to die for guilty men. 5. [4] In his great love for his own people. 6. [4] And from the scriptures, "O, give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth forever." Ps. 106: 1.

[1] The *justice* of God is that attribute which prompts him to do that which is exactly right, by every individual without respect of persons. [2] He looks only at their characters and treats men according to them. [3] He bestows common temporal mercies upon all, irrespective of moral character; the sun shines, and the rain descends upon the good and bad alike, but [4] spiritual and eternal enjoyments are bestowed only on those whose leading aim is to please him. [5] The justice of God requires him to exclude the finally incorrigible sinner from the abodes of his loyal and obedient subjects. "Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him; for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Wo unto the wicked, it shall be ill with them; for the reward of his hands shall be given him." Ps. 3: 10, 11.

[6] *Mercy is a modification* of benevolence, and leads God to pity and relieve those that are *self ruined*. [7] We sometimes pity those who are ruined by ignorance, or by the fault of others. God pities

1. What is meant by the justice of God? 2. At what alone does God look in his dealings with men?
3. What is bestowed on men without respect to their moral character or conduct? 4. On whom are spiritual and eternal mercies bestowed? 5. What does the justice of God require? 6. What is the mercy of God and what does it lead him to do? 7. What is the difference in the pity of men and God?

and relieves those who knowingly and wilfully ruin themselves. O, what a wonderful God is ours! "The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin." Ex. 24: 6, 7.

[1] *Grace*, is God's actually bestowing favor upon those who are undeserving of it, and are unworthy of receiving it. [2] Grace, in its very nature, can be bestowed only upon an unworthy object. Where worthiness commences, the province of grace ends. "If by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work." Rom. 11: 6.

[3] Grace is the *cause*, ("We love him because he first loved us,") not the *consequence*, of good works. Had not God set his love upon us and renewed our hearts, we never should have loved him. [4] "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

*Truth*, as an attribute of God, is [5] his holy aversion to falsehood. God represents things just as they are, without any deception. "God is not a

---

1. What is grace as an attribute in God? 2. On whom alone is grace bestowed? 3. What is the cause of good works? 4. Have our good works, as prayer, repentance, &c., any influence in procuring grace? 5. What is truth in God.

man, that he should lie." Num. 23: 19. "God cannot lie." Tit. 1: 2. [1]Truth, in scripture, is sometimes called *faithfulness*. God is faithful [2]in the fulfillment of his promises, and in the execution of his threatenings. [3]"Ye know, in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake concerning you, . . . so shall the Lord bring upon you all evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you, when ye have transgressed the covenant of the Lord your God, which he commanded you, and have gone and served other gods." Josh. 23: 14, 15.

All the attributes of this blessed and holy being exist in perfect harmony. He has no "darling attribute;" each is equally dear to him—each is absolutely perfect—each is infinite. Were there any conceivable limits to *any* attribute of the Divine character—were the power of any being beyond his control—could any act be performed that God could not, if he saw fit, direct otherwise—could the wisdom of any being baffle his wisdom—or were any change to take place in him, in any respect, he would cease to be our adorable *Jehovah*. But all his attributes existing in perfect harmony, represent him as an infinitely perfect being, one every way worthy of our love and service.

1. What other name is given to truth in the scriptures? 2. In what respect is God faithful? 3. Where is the evidence that God is faithful in these respects?

## CREATION AND PRESERVATION.

[1] "The work of creation, is God's making all things of nothing, by the word of his power, in the space of six days, and all very good." [2] "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." At what period this beginning was, we are not informed by the sacred writer; and [3] if, as many suppose, it was thousands of years before the earth was fitted up for the abode of men and animals, it by no means conflicts with the inspired record. In the "*beginning*," whenever it was, [4] God from *nothing* created the material universe. [5] "The worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen, were not made of the things which *do appear*." Heb. 11: 3. During the six days, every thing was formed in its most [6] perfect state — probably in full maturity. God pronounced it good, adapted to the wants of the created.

[7] *The great end of God* in creation was his own glory in making the universe, in the highest possible degree, happy. [8] His glory is both essential and declarative. [9] His *essential* glory is his *possession* of every infinite perfection, and is unalterable. [10] His *declarative* glory is the *manifestation* of those perfections, and is [11] promoted by intelligences when

1. What is the work of creation? 2. When did God make all things? 3. Does the supposition that the first creative act was many thousands of years previous to the creation of men and animals, conflict? 4. From what was the world created? 5. What proof that the matter of the universe was created? 6. In what state was every thing created? At what season of the year would we infer? 7. What was the object of God in creation? 8. How is God's glory distinguished? 9. What is his essential glory? 10. Declarative what? 11. How promoted?

they exhibit his character, and by his works as they show forth his praise. [1]The same almighty power is in operation in the preservation of the universe as was exerted in creating it. "By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all things were created by him, and *for him*, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1: 16, 17.

### THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD,

Is either *providential* or *moral*. [2]The *providential* government of God is his absolute control of all the movements of matter and of mind, throughout his vast empire, so as to accomplish [3]the end he had in view in creation. The doctrine of a special Providence, is one of the most glorious in the Bible. Plato speaks correctly, when he says, [4]"That great things cannot be rightly taken care of without taking care of small. And that in all cases, the more able and perfect any artist is, the more his skill and care appear in little as well as great things."

1. [5]In his providence, God takes care of all his creatures, especially his children. [6]"Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them

1. Does God exercise any care of the world he has created? 2. What is the providential government of God? 3. What end is accomplished? 4 What does Plato say about a providence? 5. what is the first thing to which God's providence extends? 6. What proof?

shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered." Mat. 10: 29, 30.

2. [1]He takes care of and controls inanimate matter. [2]"Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; if God so clothe the grass of the field, . . . . shall he not much more clothe you." Mat. 6: 28, 30.

3. [3]All the good or bad actions of his creatures are the subjects of his providence. [4]Holy actions and exercises spring from the operation of God's Spirit upon the heart. [5]Unholy actions and exercises, are permitted under the government of God, for wise purposes. [6]"Who in time past suffered (or permitted) all nations to walk in their own ways." Acts, 14: 16. The precise agency of God in sinful actions, has been a matter of much dispute, yet none have believed God the author of sin.

4. In his providential government, [7]God limits and restrains the actions of wicked agents, [8]so that none, however powerful or malignant, go beyond the limits he, for his own glory, allows them." [9]"Surely, the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain." Ps. 76: 10.—[9]"Because thyrage against me and thy tumult is

---

1. What the second? 2. Proof? 3. What the third? 4. From what do good actions result? 5. What agency does God exercise in sinful actions?

6. What proof that God permits sinful actions? Are siuful actions justifiable because God permits them? Why? 7. What is the 4th thing God does in the exercise of his providential government? 8. To what extent? 9. What proof?

come up into mine ears, therefore I will put *my hook in thy nose*, and *my bridle in thy lips*, and *I will turn thee back* by *the way* by which thou camest." 2 Kings, 19: 2, 28, from which it appears.

5. That [1]God directs and disposes sinful actions to good results, contrary to the intentions of the actors." [2]O, Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, . . . I will send him against a hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. Howbeit he *meaneth* not so, neither doth his heart think so." Is. 10: 5–7. Said Joseph to his brethren, "[2]As for you, ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive." Gen. 50: 20. Peter speaking of the crucifixion of our blessed Savior says, "[2]Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Acts, 2: 23. Thus, [3]by overruling the actions of wicked men contrary to their intentions, he brings order out of what, without his overruling hand, had been confusion, and causes the wrath of man to praise him, and restrains every thing that he cannot overrule to his glory. Ps. 76: 10.

The *Providential government* of God, must be

---

1. What is the fifth thing God does by his providence? 2. What proof? 3. How does God bring order out of confusion, and cause the wrath of man to praise him?

[1]just as absolute and extensive as his *power, wisdom* and *benevolence* require. "The Lord reigneth," Ps. 93: 1, is many times declared in the Bible. He reigns as a complete and absolute sovereign, as the following train of thought fully proves:

1. [2]He that made the universe has *power* to govern it.

2. [2]He has *wisdom* to govern it in the most intelligent manner. Being wiser than any other, or all other beings, he is better qualified to govern than any other being, or than all others.

3. [2]His *benevolence* would *require him* to govern. Having wisdom to govern better than any other being, and having power to govern just as his wisdom should direct, and having the power to govern once in his hand, as he must have by creation, it would exhibit a want of benevolence to give up the reins of government into a less capable hand, and especially so, as he can govern with perfect ease. Should God cease to govern a world, an atom, or an insect, he would cease to be infinitely benevolent towards that ungoverned world, atom, or insect. God, in the exercise of his benevolence, governs not only worlds, but insects and atoms. Matter in all of its modifications; mind in all its motions; and in all beings, men, angels, and devils, are under his control, as

4. The scriptures abundantly prove, [3]"He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and

1. How extensive is God's providential government? 2. What four arguments are used to prove it? 3. Mention some scripture texts to prove a controlling and a special providence.

among the inhabitants of the earth." Dan. 4: 35. None move but by his permission or direction.—"The Lord is King forever and ever." Ps. 10: 16. [3]"The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool." Isai. 66: 1. [3]"Art thou not a God in heaven? and rulest not thou over all the kingdoms of the heathen, and in thy hand is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee."—2 Chron. 20: 6. [3]"Thine is the power and the glory and the kingdom; and thou art exalted as head above all." 1 Chron. 29: 11. And saith Jehovah, [3]"I have made the earth, the man and the beast, that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me." Jer. 27: 5. [3]"Thine is the power and the glory and the kingdom; and thou art exalted as head above all." 1 Chron. 29: 11. [3]"The very hairs of your head are all numbered." Math. 10: 30.

The *moral government* of God, has respect only [1]to free, intelligent and rational beings, whose conduct it regulates by the force of motives. [2]All the subjects of God's moral government, though absolutely under his control, are essentially free. No intelligence is either forced to obey or disobey.—Whatever they do, is an act of their own free will. Their freedom is the ground of their being subjects of law. [1]How God can control the volitions and ac-

1. To what has God's moral government respect? 2. Are all the subjects of God's moral government absolutely under his control, yet free?

tions of men, and yet man act freely, [1]is not so easily explained. [2]Yet the fact is clearly taught in the scriptures. [3]There are difficulties in all systems of truth; and [4]that system is to be preferred which has the fewest. If we adopt the theory that man is not free, [5]we make him a mere machine, and consequently not a fit subject for reward or punishment. If we adopt the theory that God does not govern the volitions and conduct of his moral subjects, [6]we deny his sovereignty; rob him of his wisdom, of his benevolence, his power and his *throne*. We make the infinite Jehovah unworthy of our love! If we adopt the true theory, that God is an absolute sovereign, and that man is perfectly free, [7]we make the whole scheme of God's government plain and easily understood. [8]That God is a *Sovereign*, I have just shown. That man is *free* is seen, 1. [9]From the fact that he is made the subject of law. No one considers an axe or a hoe accountable. 2. [9]He is addressed as such in the Bible, by numerous invitations, promises and threatenings. 3. [9]In all God's dealings with man, he has treated him as free. He punishes the disobedient and rewards the obedient. 4. [9]Man is conscious of freedom. He knows, and cannot be convinced to the contrary, that he acts and wills according to his prevailing choice. From all

1. How can God control the hearts of men, and yet they be free? 2. What is clearly taught in the scriptures? 3. Is there any system of divinity free from difficulties? 4. If not, what system is best? 5. Suppose we say that man is not free? 6. Suppose we say he does not govern all things? 7. Suppose we say that God governs, and yet man is free? 8. What has been proved? repeat the argument. 9. How do you prove that man is free?

which it is clear that man is [1]just as free, though governed, as though there were no God in the universe.

As a rule of duty, God has given [2] a holy and a righteous *law*, one that is absolutely perfect, which allows of nothing contrary to his holy nature. [3]It consists, as all law necessarily must, of precepts, rewards, and punishments. [4]A law without a penalty were mere advice. [5]The ten commandments are an epitome of the moral law, the substance of which is, "[6]Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all thy strength, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Mark, 12: 30, 31. God requires us to love every being [7]according to his moral worth, or true excellence. [8]As he is more excellent than *all* other beings, he requires us to love him *more* than all others. If the requisitions of this law were fulfilled, love and love only, would pervade all God's empire. [9]Happiness would reign. [10]In requiring perfect love, nothing arbitrary or unreasonable is demanded; it is simply to love God according to our ability, or capacity. [11]He requires no impossibility, nothing but what he has given a capacity to do. If any being does not fully come up to the requirement, as there is none among the fallen that does, [12]it is

1. How free is man? 2. What has God given man as a rule of duty?—3. Of what does it consist? 4. Of what use were a law without a penalty? Could it exist? 5. Where do we find an epitome of God's law? 6. What is the substance of it? 7. How much should we love every being? 8. How much to love God? 9. If God's law were obeyed, what were the result? 10. Is God's law reasonable? 11. Have we the capacity to obey? 12. Why do not men obey?

not for want of a capacity to do it, but of an inclination, which evidently constitutes his guilt. [1]The *reward* of obedience is the eternal favor of God. "The man which doeth these things shall live by them." Rom. 10: 5. [2]The *penalty* for disobedience is his eternal displeasure and curse. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Ezek. 8: 4. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2: 17, i. e. thou shalt be made mortal, subject to death, and to everlasting misery.

### THE TRINITY.

By the doctrine of the trinity is meant [3]the mysterious existence of three persons in the divine nature. [4]The proof of a plurality of persons in the Godhead is found throughout the Bible. The first Hebrew word used to denote the name of God, [Elohim,] is plural, and so is the word used to denote the Supreme Being in many passages, and yet it is construed with a singular verb, as if expressly to teach a plurality in unity. Thus in the first chapter of Genesis, "Elohim created the heavens and the earth," "Elohim said let there be light," &c. Passages alluding to this plurality are numerous, as, "Let *us* make man in *our* image, and after *our* likeness." "Behold, the man has come as one of us."

---

1. What is the reward of obedience? 2. The penalty for disobedience? 3. What is meant by the doctrine of the trinity? 4. Where do you find the proof of a plurality of persons?

"Let *us* go down, &c. [1] All these passages imply a plurality of persons, and if they do not mean to teach it, God has used language which is calculated to mislead the mind, and which has misled thousands. The apostolic benediction, is a prayer, in which [2] the three persons in the trinity are recognized. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all, amen." 2 Cor. 13: 14. [3] By the command of Christ, the ordinance of baptism was to be administered in the name of a plurality of persons, the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*. Math. 28: 29. The three persons are all brought to view in the baptism of our Savior. "And lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him: And lo, a voice from heaven, saying: This is my beloved Son." Math. 3: 16, 17. Here is seen God, the Father, speaking; God, the Son, baptized; God, the Spirit, in the form of a dove, descending and lighting upon the Son. "And these three are *one*." 1 John, 5: 7.

*The Father is God.* [4] "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." John, 1: 18.

*The Son is God.* [5] "But unto the *Son* he saith, Thy throne, O *God*, is forever and ever." Heb. 1: 8.

1. What does this plural form of the noun, in Genesis and many other places, and the expression, "let us," &c., imply? 2. What is recognized in the apostolic benediction? 3. How was baptism performed? 4. How do you prove that the Father is God? 5. The Son?

*The Holy Ghost is God.* [1]"Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost? thou hast not lied unto men but unto *God*." Acts, 5: 34.

The Son is *God* and *man* united. "[2]For in him [Christ] dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead, bodily." Col. 2: 9. We call them *persons* [3]for the want of a better term, and because Christ himself used the personal pronouns, [4] "*I*," "*Thou*," and "*He*," to denote each subsistance. Thus he prayed, "That all christians might be one." Thou, Father, art in me and I in thee." John, 19: 21.—"If I depart, I will send *Him*" [the Holy Ghost] "unto you." John, 16: 7. "He shall glorify *me*," &c. "All things that the *Father* hath are mine," &c. v. 14 and 15. Here a threefold subsistance is brought to view, and all the personal pronouns used in two consecutive verses. The same attributes and works are ascribed to *each* person in the trinity.

The following are a few of the arguments used in support of Christ's supreme divinity.

1. [5]The *peculiar* and *essential attributes* of *Jehovah* are *ascribed* to *Jesus Christ*. As self-existence and immutability. "[6]Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to day and forever," Heb. 13: 8, i. e., Jesus Christ, the same unchangeably, in all time past, present and to come. He declares his own independence

1. The Holy Ghost? 2. How do you prove that the Son is God and man united? 3. Why do we call them persons? 4. What pronouns does Christ use when he speaks of the different persons in the trinity? 5. What is the first argument for the supreme divinity of Christ? 6. Where is self-existence ascribed to Christ?

[1] by saying that he has power to lay down his life and to take it up again. John, 10: 18. [2] He also declares, "I am the first and the last." "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive evermore." Rev. 1: 17, 18. As he is the first and the last, *none*, not even the Father, can be before or after him; consequently he must be God, and eternal. "[3] In the beginning was the Logos, [translated Word,] and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God." John, 1: 1. And the Logos was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." 14th v. "His goings forth have been of old, from everlasting." Micah, 5: 2.

[4] *Omnipotence*, is ascribed to him, "For he is far above all principalities, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." Eph. 1: 21. "He is called the head of all principality, and power." Col. 2: 10. "The Almighty," Rev. 1: 8. [5] He claims *Omnipresence* for himself. For [6] while on earth, he said, "no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which *is* in heaven." John, 3: 13.—How, if merely man, could he be in heaven, and at the same time on earth, conversing with Nicodemus?

---

1. How does he declare his independence? 2. Is eternity ascribed to Christ? 3 What is meant by the Word or Logos, John, 1: 1? 4. Is omnipotence ascribed to Christ? Proof? 5 What is said of omnipresence? 6 As God, was he in heaven and on earth at the same time?

Again he says, "[1]Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Math. 18: 20. [2]He is *omniscient*. He knows the hearts of men. He knows their thoughts. Acts, 1: 24. Yet Jehovah declares, as though it were his work alone. "I the Lord search the hearts, I try the reins." Jer. 17: 10. [3]"Thou, Jehovah, thou only knowest the hearts of all the children of men." 1 Kings, 18: 39. [4]If, then, Jehovah *only* searches the hearts, and if the scriptures positively affirm, as indeed they do, that Christ, searches the hearts, then, the scriptures must affirm a falsehood, or else Christ must be Jehovah.

2. [5]*The works which none but God can do are ascribed to him.* [6]Creation is ascribed to him. So all [7]the early christian fathers understood it, and so did [8]the opposers of religion. That bitter enemy of Christ, "Julian, the apostate," said, "[9]None of the apostles besides John, ascribed to him the creation of the world." [10]"All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." John, 1: 3. "The world was made by him." v. 10. "[11]By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principal-

1 Was he, and is he in more than one place on earth at the same time?—What does that show? 2 Does Jesus Christ see and know all things and know the hearts of men? 3 What is said of Jehovah? 4 What do you infer from this? 5 What is the 2d argument for the divinity of Christ?—What works? 7 Who understood that creation was ascribed to Christ? 8 Who else? 9 What did Julian say? 10 What did the apostle John say? 11 What is taught in Col, 1: 16, 17?

ities, or powers. "*All* things were created by him, and for him, and he is above all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1: 16, 17. [1]Not only creation, but also preservation is ascribed to Jesus Christ in this passage. [2]He possessed in himself the power of raising the dead, and in the resurrection it will be his peculiar work [3]to reanimate our mortal bodies and to change the corruptible into incorruptible—to fashion the bodies of the saints like unto his most glorious body, and to say to them, "Come, ye blessed of my Father,"—to bring forth those who have no part in the first resurrection, to the resurrection of damnation, and say depart ye cursed." Phil. 3: 21. [4]The apostles performed miracles, but only in the name of Christ. "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth," said Peter, "rise up and walk." Acts, 3: 6. [4]Christ performed miracles in his own name, and by his own power and authority, showing [5]that the power he exercised was his own, not delegated. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth [6]his glory, and his disciples believed on him." John, 2: 11. He "is the head [originator] of all principality and power." Col. 2: 10, and 1: 11. Said he to the young man, [7]"Young man, *I* say unto thee, arise,

---

1. What besides creation is ascribed to Christ in this verse? Can any being, by his own power, besides God, raise the dead? 2. What did Jesus Christ possess? What does that prove? 3. What will be his work in the resurrection? 4. What is the difference in the way that prophets and apostles performed miracles, and Christ? 5. What does this show? 6. Whose glory did Jesus show forth in his first miracle in Cana of Galilee? 7. Can you mention some places where Jesus performed miracles in his own name?

and he that was dead sat up and began to speak." Luke, 7: 14, 15. [7]To the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue, he said, "Maid, arise, and her spirit came again, and she arose straightway." Luke, 8: 54, 55. [7]To his beloved Lazarus he said, "Come forth, and he that had been four days dead, came out of the grave." John, 11: 43. [7]To the leper, "*I* will; be thou clean," and his leprosy departed. Mark. 8: 3. [7]To the paralytic, "Arise, take up thy bed and walk." Math. 9: 6, and [7]to the winds and waves, "Peace, be still; and there was a great calm.

3. [1]*Titles, peculiar* to *Jehovah*, are *ascribed* to *Jesus Christ*, in the scriptures. [2]Jesus Christ must, therefore, be God, or these titles are misapplied.—[3]He is called God. "The Logos [Greek] was with God, and [4]the Logos was God." John, 1: 1. He is called not only God, but the *true* God.—[5]"This is the true God and eternal life." 1 John, 5: 20. But unto the Son he saith, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." Heb. 1: 8. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and [6]his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Isai. 9: 6. Christ is called Jehovah, the incommunicable name of God,—a name which the

1. What is the third argument for the divinity of Christ? 2. What argument is drawn from this? 3. Is Jesus Christ called God? Who is meant by the Logos? John, 1: 1. 4. What is the Logos affirmed to be? 5. Is he called the true God? 6. Is he called the mighty God?

Jews out of superstitious veneration, never pronounced after the captivity, and cleaned their pen before writing it, and then wrote it in the Samaritan character, instead of the common Hebrew. It means self-existence, and is well rendered, "He who is, and who was, and is to come." Rev. 1: 4, and 11: 17, and yet by this "shuddering name" as the Jews called it, the highest token of respect in any language, Jesus Christ is called. "Behold the day is come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days shall Judah be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; [1]and this is the name, whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH TSIDKENU, [*Jehovah*, our righteousness.] Jer. 23: 56.

[2]He is called Emmanuel, which signifies, according to the apostle's interpretation, God *with us*, i. e. God tabernacling in human nature, so as to be really God and man. [3]"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign, [evidence of the Messiah's advent, that cannot be disputed.] Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call [the virgin shall call] his name Emmanuel." Isai. 7: 14.

4. [4]*Divine Worship was paid to Christ*, by his disciples and the early christians. The worship they paid to him was as supreme as has ever been paid by

---

1. Is Christ ever called Jehovah? 2. By what other name is he called, that evinces his divinity? 3. In what passage? 4. What is the fourth argument for the divinity of Christ?

any who have believed in his divine nature, and with as much reverence as they paid it to the great Jehovah. [1]No intimation is anywhere given that they had any thought of worshipping him in a subordinate sense. God commands all the angels to worship him," "and when he bringeth forth his first begotten into the world, he saith, let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. 1: 6. Stephen, in his dying moments, prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."—Acts, 7: 59. God requires that all men should honor the Son, [2]even as [in the same manner as] they honor the Father. John, 5: 23. This, Christ himself taught.

[3]The great mass of the Church, from that day to this, paid him divine honors. So common was it for the early christians to worship Christ, that they were called christians, (probably out of derision,) first at Antioch, [4]for worshipping him as God,—[5]Their enemies who derided Christ, charged this upon them. Julian, called the apostate, who was once a professing christian, though afterwards the worst antagonist christianity had to endure, and who knew what the early christians believed, and wrote against them in the fourth century, says, speaking of John, [6]"that none of the other disci-

---

1. Is any intimation given, that the disciples, or early christians, worshipped him in any subordinate sense? 2. To what extent does God require all men to worship Christ? 3. How has Christ been regarded by the great [redacted] of the church, since his ascension? 4. Why were the disciples called christians? 5. Who charged them with worshipping Christ, [redacted] God?—6. What does Julian say about John?

ples dared to call Jesus God," showing that [1]he understood that John taught that Jesus was God, and that this was the common sentiment in his day. [2]Pliny, in his letters to the Emperor Trajan, by whose orders, thousands were put to death, says that christians worshipped "Christ, as God."

The following remarks may show the absurdity of denying the divinity of Christ:

1. [3]If Jesus Christ was not truly God, the great mass of those who have lived and died in the hope of a better resurrection, have firmly believed in one of the most *fatal* errors, and have been guilty of the most aggravated sin—that of *idolatry*. They have worshipped a creature, when God hath said, "thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Math. 4: 10. [4]Those who worship religiously a creature, are idolators.—[5]God is the only proper object of religious worship. He will not give his glory to another. Isai. 48: 2.

2. [6]If Jesus Christ be not divine, God has made a *communication* which has been the means of leading the mass of christians into idolatry. If he has made this communication designedly, he cannot be *benevolent*, if undesignedly, he cannot be *infinite* in *wisdom*, else he had known the effect it would pro-

---

1. What did he evidently understand John to teach? 2. What further evidence from the heathen that christians worshipped Jesus as God? 3. What is the first consideration to show the absurdity of denying Christ's true divinity? 4. Who are idolators? 5. Who alone is the proper object of religious worship? 6. Wherein does the second absurdity appear?

duce upon the minds of men in leading them so generally astray.

3. [1]If Jesus Christ was not truly God, we are forced to the conclusion that he was a *dishonest man*, consequently *an impostor*. [2]He gave his disciples such instructions as caused them to regard him as divine; and when Thomas called him his "Lord and his God;" and Peter ascribed omniscience, a divine attribute to him, "Lord, thou knowest all things," [3]instead of correcting them, he affirmed, "I and my Father are one." John, 10: 30. "Ye call me master and Lord; and ye say *well*, for so I am. John, 13: 13. Many times he expresses himself in a similar manner: "I am in the Father, and he in me." "He that hateth me, hateth my Father." [4]Paul was so convinced on the teaching of Christ, that he was equal with God, that he affirms that Christ "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Phil. 2: 6.

His disciples were not the only persons who understood him to affirm his equality with the Father. [5]The Jews, believing him to be a mere man, were highly incensed against him, when he said, "I and my Father are one." [6]They charged him with blasphemy, [7]because he made himself God,—appropri-

---

1. What is the third consideration? 2. What impression did his instructions leave on the minds of hisdisciples? 3. Where they used language to him, that showed that they thought him to be divine, does he correct them? 4. What effect had the instructions of Christ on the mind of Paul? 5. Who else besides his disciples thought he meant to teach his divinity and equality with the Father? 6. With what did they charge him? 7. Why?

ated to himself a divine nature, and took up stones to stone him. [1]Jesus knew why they took up stones to stone him; but [2]instead of correcting their impressions of what he taught, he made another declaration implying the same thing, which even more enraged them. He persisted in affirming his equality with God, and [3]that he was "Christ, the Son of God," even when arraigned before the highest tribunal of the Jewish nation to answer for his life.

[4]The high priest understood him to assert his divine nature, and [5]"rent his clothes, saying, he has spoken blasphemy." [6]On this charge of blasphemy, the council decided that he was guilty of death. [7]Jesus knew why they were so enraged against him, for they had told him, "because thou, being a man, makest thyself God." John, 10: 33. Now it is plain [8]that he was what he knew the Jews understood he claimed to be—God—or he was a dishonest man in not correcting their mistake. [9]For with a death for blasphemy before him, he declares, and never recedes from it, "I and my Father are one."

4. Hence, [10]if he was not truly God, as they understood him to affirm, he was not only a dishon-

---

1. Did Jesus know why they took up stones to stone him? 2. Did he correct their impressions? 3. What did he persist in affirming when arraigned before the high priest? 4. What did the high priest understand him to assert by calling himself the Son of God? 5. What did he do and say? 6. On what charge did the high priest decide that he was guilty of death? 7. Did Jesus know why they were so enraged against him? 8. What inference is drawn from his silence? 9. Does he ever recede from his declaring his equality with the Father? 10. What is the fourth absurdity involved in a denial of the divinity of Christ?

est man and an imposter, but he suffered *justly* according to the Jewish law, as a blasphemer.

5. Hence, [1]if Jesus Christ was not God, he made no atonement, and none has yet been made, for the sins of the world. [2]In order to make an atonement, he must at least be an innocent person—one free from sin—no imposter or blasphemer; and if not God, he was both. [3]To deny, therefore, the Supreme Divinity of our blessed Lord and Master, is to undermine the whole scheme of redemption for a lost and ruined world; to give the Jews all the excuse they can desire for putting him to death; to acknowledge that he died for his own sin of blasphemy, and not for the sins of others. I start back with horror from the denial of a doctrine, when that denial drives me to such absurdities.

Objection. [4]Christ is spoken of as inferior to the Father, as praying to the Father, and as acknowledging the superiority of the Father. Answer. [5]All those passages which speak of Christ, and where he speaks of himself as inferior to the Father, refer either to his human nature or to his mediatorial office, in both of which he was inferior to him. As a man, he was born, grew up and increased in stature and in wisdom, whilst as God, he knew all things. [6]As man, he possessed a human body, miraculously conceived, but otherwise like that of

---

1. What the fifth and last? 2. What was necessary to atonement? 3. What are the fearful consequences of denying the divinity of Christ? 4. What objection is stated? 5. How answered? 6. What did Christ possess

other men, and a human soul, subject to all sinless passions and exercises. In him dwelt [1]"all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," i. e., being in a bodily form. Col. 2: 9. [2]These two natures are still mysteriously united in him as our Mediator and Intercessor. "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." 1 Tim. 3: 16.

---

## ARTICLE II.

Inspiration — The Bible from God.

[3]The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the divinely inspired word of God, and are the only rule of faith and practice.

The books which we receive as of divine origin, are [4]*thirty-nine* in the Old, and [5]*twenty-seven* in the New Testamest. The Apochryphal books for reasons assigned in the history of the Bible, (page 13.) are rejected as uninspired, and possessing no authority in the churches, though the historical portions of some of them are important.

### INSPIRATION.

The *Holy Scriptures* are a full declaration of the

---

as man? 1. What dwelt in his human body? 2. Are there two natures still united in Christ? 3. What is taught in this article? 4. How many books in the Old Testament? 5. How many in the New? Can you repeat

mind and will of God to us. [1]They claim to be written by men divinely appointed, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2 Tim. 3: 16. "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. 1: 21.

[2]A complete and immediate communication of some things, which they would not otherwise have known, was made to the minds of the sacred writers by the Holy Spirit, in much that they wrote, and in all, they were so superintended and guided, as made it impossible for them to err in the least particular, or to omit any thing necessary, or to insert any thing unnecessary or different from what the Holy Spirit designed. [3]Facts are recorded simply as facts. And the declarations of wicked agents as a true record of their declarations. Thus, the serpent said to the woman, "Thou shalt not surely die." This is recorded, not as an inspired and unerring truth, like the declaration of God, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," but as the precise assertion of the father of lies.

[4]Not only the ideas, but also the words, of Scripture, are dictated by the Holy Spirit. This must certainly be the case [5]in all those communications

---

in their order the books in the Old Testament? In the New? Why do we reject the Apocrypha? 1. Are the Scriptures inspired? 2. What is meant by the inspiration of the Scriptures? 3. How are facts and the declarations of wicked agents recorded? 4. Are the words of Scripture inspired? 5. When must the words be inspired?

coming directly from God. Some of them, as the ten commandments, were written by God and then spoken audibly in the hearing of the assembled multidude. Others were suggested in various ways to prophets and holy men who were to deliver them to the people. [1]If the words selected were not dictated by the infallible spirit, they may not convey the meaning intended. Besides, [2]in many prophecies, the writers did not understand their own communications, as is evident from [3]1 Pet. 1: 11, where the prophets are represented as "Searching what, or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." And surely, [4]if they did not understand, they could not clothe their prophecies in appropriate language, unless divinely inspired. [5]Paul affirms that the Apostles spoke "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." 1Cor. 2: 13. [6]The Holy Spirit exercised such a supervision over the several writers as to secure the use of such words as precisely expressed the ideas designed to be conveyed. And yet so that each should express himself in accordance with his own peculiar genius, education and habits. This ac-

1. If the words were not inspired, is it certain they would always convey the meaning intended by the Holy Ghost? 2. Did the prophets always understand their own communications? 3. What evidence of it? 4. Is it reasonable to suppose that they could select words to communicate what they did not understand? 5. What does Paul say about the words of scripture? 6. Did the supervision which the Holy Spirit exercised, control or destroy the peculiarities of the individual writers?

counts for the diversity of style by the same spirit. [1]To give up the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures is greatly to weaken our confidence in them without gaining any advantage. For it is as easy to reconcile the "various readings" with a verbal inspiration, as with an inspiration of ideas.

The importance of this article, and the nature of the proofs, will justify me in protracting it to more than would seem to be its proper length. And yet but a meagre outline of the common argument for the divinity of the Scriptures can be given.

## THE BIBLE FROM GOD.

1. [2]A revelation of God's will is *necessary* for the good of the human family. [3]Without it, the wisest men that have ever lived, have lived and died in agonizing uncertainty of the most important of all truths. [4]Though the vague idea of God has been common to all nations, yet none have had a *correct* idea of the existence of an infinite being, of a holy, *sin-hating* nature. They worshipped almost every object as a representation of God. But among the [5]thirty thousand gods of ancient and literary Greece, or the [6]three hundred and thirty millions worshipped at the present day by priest-ridden and degraded In-

---

1. Is any thing gained by giving up the verbal inspiration of the scriptures? 2. What is the first argument to prove the Bible from God? 3. What has been the the condition of men without a revelution? 4. Have they believed in a God, and did they understand his character? 5. How many Gods had ancient Greece? 6. Modern India?

dia, [1] the true God is not found. [2] Men never become any better without a knowledge of God. Heathenism is as bad now as it was three thousand years ago.

[3] Though the worship of false gods, as facts abundantly demonstrate, has been unspeakably more expensive, and has kept the mass of the people poor, (for irreligion is always more expensive than religion,)—though [4] men have always worshipped, yet [5] they have never, without a revelation, worshipped a spiritual and a holy being. [a] With all his philosophy, man has been ignorant of his relation to God, only as it has been made known in the Bible. [6] He has seen the world undone, but no way to recover it. Conscience and the Spirit of God have shown him his guilt, and he has been bowed down by a sense of it; yet, without a revelation, [6] he has never learned how sin could be forgiven, or where he should find his highest happiness, or what would be his state after death. [7] Of their immortality the wisest of the heathen were uncertain, as the discourses of Plato and Socrates fully show. [8] The practices of the most virtuous among the ancient heathen philosophers, were as corrupt and revolting as their views were dark and obscure. [8] The lives of Seneca, Socrates and Plato, were such as to render them

---

1 Have they the true God? 2. Do men grow any better without the Bible? 3. Which is the more expensive the worship of false, or the true God? 4. Do all men worship something? 5. What have they not worshipped? 6. Of what has man been ignorant? 7. Were they certain as to their immortality? 8. What can be said in favor of the practices of heathen morality?

unfit for society. [8]They would be shut up in a prison, according to our laws, for their unnatural crimes! If such was the character of teachers of morality, what could be expected of the mass of the people? A revelation of God's will was necessary to the good of man.

2. [1]What was so *necessary*, it is reasonable to suppose a God of infinite *benevolence*, would grant; for it must be allowed that he who created the mind was able to make any necessary communication to it. And if he could give directions for the good of man, benevolence would require that he should give them, and [2]we infer that one has been given.

3. [3]The Holy Scriptures are that revelation, or we have none. [4]All merely pretended revelations are most evidently tissues of falsehood and deception, unworthy of the character of God. [5]They appeal to the lowest passions. [6]Their influence is not calculated to make men virtuous, useful, or happy. The reward they promise to the obedient is [7]sensual gratification rather than spiritual enjoyment. [8]The Bible, on the contrary, appeals to the highest part of man's nature—his reason, his understanding and his heart. [9]It teaches the mortification of sensual appetites as beneath the dignity of his spiritual nature, and inculcates the practice of the most rigid

1. If a revelation was necessary, what may we reasonably suppose? 2. What do we infer? 3. What is the third argument? 4. What is said of pretended revelation? 5. To what do they appeal? 6. What is their influence? 7. What inducements do they offer to the obedient? 8. To what does the Bible appeal? 9. What does it teach and inculcate?

virtues, as the only sure way to happiness in this life, and expressly declares the necessity of a new heart in order to happiness in the life to come. [1]The spirit of the Bible is entirely different from the spirit of pretended revelations. [2]*They* breathe revenge and death to all opposers, and teach the propagation of their principles by the power of the sword. [3]The Bible teaches the forgiveness of enemies, and makes its conquests only by subduing the heart by the power of truth, accompanied by the Holy Spirit.

4. [4]The Bible exhibits a *character* beyond finite conception. [5]An infinite Being purely spiritual, self-existing, omnipresent, filling all space, pervading all places and beings, with almighty power which nothing could resist, with a perfectly holy character, bending all his energies to promote universal happiness, had never entered into the mind of man; [6]much less had the mind conceived of his existing in tri-unity—three in one and one in three—had it not been revealed.

[7]The ancients spoke of their gods as forming the world out of pre-existing materials, and of its being governed by fate; [8]revelation informs us that the worlds were formed out of *nothing* by the word

1. What is said of the spirit of the Bible? 2. What do they breathe? 3. What does the Bible teach? 4. What is the fourth evidence that the Bible is from God? 5. Would such a character enter into the mind of man?—Has it ever entered where they have had no revelation? 6. If men had not discovered the attributes of God, would they have discovered his triune existence? 7. What was the idea of the heathen about the creation and government of the world? 8. Does revelation teach that the matter of the world was created by God?

of his power. [1]That He who "spake and it was done, who commanded and it stood fast," laid a plan that extended to every part of his dominions and to every being in them, that he shapes by his sovereignty every event so as to accomplish the great end of creation—his own glory in the highest happiness of the universe. We are indebted, not to the mind of man, but to revelation, for such a view of the divine character. [2]Heathen philosophers and poets have studied to draw up a model character, and yet were unable to present one with which they felt satisfied that it was in every respect what it should be. [3]The character of Jesus Christ, as drawn by the uneducated evangelists, in their histories, apparently without design, and by simply recording the incidents of his life, infinitely transcend as a model all the studied characters of heathen sages. Jesus Christ is a perfect model. His spirit, words and actions were always such as to command our admiration. In every condition in which their unadorned history has placed him he always acted just right, and never was guilty of the least wrong. [4]A character so spotless, and with such traits as were possessed by the Redeemer, had never been drawn by worldly wisdom—nor been found in the Bible, had it been the work of men. His virtues, such as

1. What does it teach respecting its government? 2. Could the heathen draw up a perfect model character? 3. What have the evangelists done without design? 4. Is it conceivable, that men, who had never seen the virtues which he practiced recommended, but always despised, should draw up such a character with any rational expectation of its being admired?

forgiveness, and love to enemies, now seen to be so amiable, had never been recommended or practiced beyond the influence of revelation.

5. The writers of the Bible were either good or bad men. [1]Bad men would not write a book, every word of which condemned them to eternal ruin; and that was entirely opposite to the practices and feelings of the whole human family; that stripped men of every virtue, and represented them as totally sinful and depraved, and that laid them helpless in the hands of an almighty sovereign. Besides, its doctrines and precepts are, and always have been, hated by wicked men. They never had conceived the idea of writing such a book. For bad men to write the Bible, were for them to write a book to frustrate by its teachings their own evil designs; which is inconceivable.

As bad men neither would or could write such a book, so neither would or could good men. [1]Good men would not write a lie and then attempt to palm it off as the word of God, if they could; such an attempt would stamp their character with infamy. And they could not, if they would. 1st. [2]Its conceptions are too grand to be the product of human minds. 2d. [2]If they had produced it, there never was a time when the world would receive such a book, containing such doctrines and precepts, as the word

1. What is the force of the fifth argument? 2. Why might not the Bible be a kind of pious fraud, written by uninspired yet well-meaning men?

of God and their rule of duty, on mere human testimony.

6. The Bible is the word of God or a forgery. But [1]there was no conceivable motive to forge *such* a book. [2]Its reception was in the highest degree improbable, on account of its opposing the feelings and inclinations of men. To succeed as a human production, it must meet with popular favor. That it never has met with popular favor is evident from the opposition that it has ever encountered from all classes of men. It has never been a popular book, nor one which ungodly men have loved to read. No man of sense, designing to advance himself to favor and power among the people, had ever enacted such laws and made such requirements, as did the Hebrew law-giver. And as [3]no particular favors were shown to his own family, it is evident that he was not a selfish man.

[4]The enemies of religion call Moses a conjurer. But [5]could he, by the conjurer's art, make Pharaoh and his wise men believe that the first born of man and beast were dead throughout all the land of Egypt? [5]Could he expect to make the nation of Israel consent to give up their cherished idolatry, and give the tenth of their possessions, the first

1. Is there any reason to suppose the Bible a forgery? 2. Why? If a heathen had attempted to forge a book purporting to be from the gods, would it not evidently be written for some selfish purpose, and be, on the whole, calculated to please? Has the Bible ever pleased the carnal heart? Could it, then, have been written by wise or designing men? 3. Is there any evidence that the first writers of the Bible were selfish men? 4. What have the enemies of religion called Moses? 5. Is such a supposition reasonable?

fruits of their cattle and of the field, to support a new system of self-denying religion? [5]Would it be rational to suppose he would recommend the whole multitude, composed of about two millions of people, to cease from labor one-seventh part of the time? And to let their lands lay idle every seventh year, and neither go out to war nor resist the encroachments of the enemy on the Sabbath day? [5]What commander would ever think of enacting such a law? [5]Could he expect to prevail on the landholders to relinquish their possessions and restore the land to their original possessor, when the sabbatical year arrived? [5]Moses surely had been destitute of sense had he expected to impose such a law upon the people. [1]He never could have succeeded but for the awful thunderings of Sinai, and the overwhelming evidence that it was from God.

The writers of the New Testament were imposters or honest men. [2]If imposters, they were the most remarkable men the world has ever known. [2]They set out in an enterprize, in which if they succeeded, nothing but poverty, ignominy and reproach awaited them as long as they lived, according to their own teachings [2]Their leaders had been ignominiously executed, and death awaited them, [2]and yet they went on in the face of death and every terror to carry out a cheat, which, if believed, would be of no benefit to them. [2]Thousands on

1. How were the people induced to adopt such laws? 2. Is there any reason to suppose that the writers of the New Testament were imposters?

thousands were not only deprived of every earthly possession, and made the offscouring of all things, but suffered the most shocking and awful deaths, in testimony of their sincerity and of the truth which they had seen and heard. [1]More than three millions, it is computed, were put to death within three hundred years after Christ, for professing their belief in him and worshipping him as God. They could not have been imposters nor were they deceived in reference to their belief.

7. [2]The *wisest* and *best* of men, in all ages, have believed the Bible to be the word of God. Array the believers in divine revelation on one side, and the disbelievers in it on the other, and then let any candid man say with which party truth would most likely be found. [3]On the side of revelation he will find thousands of men of the clearest minds, and most benovolent hearts, and most exemplary conduct, who have excelled in literary attainments, and who have devoted their whole lives in examining the claims of the Bible to be the word of God. [4]These men have been numerous in almost every age, and [5]men of the greatest candor.

[6]On the other side, you will generally, not always, find men of vicious lives, and however well educa-

---

1. How many were put to death, within three hundred years, for their attachment to the cause of religion? 2. What is the 7th argument for the divine origin of the scriptures? 3. If believers in revelation are arrayed on one side and unbelievers on the other, where will the ripest scholars, the best men and the most research for truth be found? 4. Have many men spent their lives in examining the claims of the Bible? 5. What has been their character? 6. What has been the character of the opposers of revelation in general?—

ted, men who are ignorant of the Bible, the book they condemn. [1]No champion of infidelity has ever sat down for one whole year and candidly examined the claims of the Bible to be the book of God. [2]Gibbon, Hume and Paine were exceedingly ignorant of the Bible. [3]When Paine wrote his Age of Reason, where he condemns the Bible and ridicules religion, he had never read, according to his own testimony, the New Testament.

[4]Skeptics who have sat down to a candid investigation of the claims of the Bible, have usually arisen with a full conviction of its divine authority. And even [5]some who have commenced the examination merely to cavil, have been overwhelmed by the evidence that crowded upon them, and convinced that it came from God, and have been converted from opposers to the most able defenders of christianity. This was the case with Soame Jenyns, Lord Lyttleton and Gilbert West, each of whom have written ably in defence of revelation. I regard this a strong argument in favor of the Bible. [6]The worst of men have been against it, the best of men for it.

8. The general *scope* of the Bible shows it to have emanated from God. If it had emanated from man, something had been said of the dignity of hu-

1. Has any champion of infidelity ever spent his life in searching for the truth, or examining candidly the claims of the Bible? 2. What is said of Gibbon, Hume, Paine? 3. Paine wrote against the Bible—did he understand it? 4. What has been the result when skeptics have candidly set down to study the Bible? 5. Who have been among some of the most able defenders of the Bible? 6. What is laid down as a strong argument for the Bible?

man nature, and to please the carnal mind. Instead of this, [1]its *great design* is to exalt God and to abase and humble the pride of man. [2]*God, all and in all, is its great theme.*

9. [3]Its *influence* in restraining vice and promoting virtue, shows it to be of superhuman origin. Whereever the Bible goes, men are made better, more useful and more happy. [4]It promotes good laws and good order in society. [5]The rights of men are better regarded. [6]Females are elevated from the condition of slaves, to that of the companion and equal of man.

10. The *miracles* wrought by the sacred writers, to confirm their mission, is a strong proof of the truth of Scripture. And there is ample evidence that these miracles were actually performed. [7]They were performed openly, in the presence of thousands of witnesses—in the face of enemies. [8]Accounts of these miracles were published and circulated over the land, while those before whom they were performed were still living, and who were men of rank and influence, who hated the apostles and Christ, and would have proved them imposters, had it been in their power. But they, [9]with all their learning, and all the facilities for investigation at hand, and on the

1. What is the great design of the Bible? 2. Its theme? 3. What argument is drawn from the influence of the Bible in making men better? 4. What effect has it on society? 5. On the rights of men? 6. On the condition of females? 7. What evidence have we that miracles were really performed? 8. Was it generally known that miracles were said to be performed, or was it known only among the ignorant and unlearned? 9. Were those who lived at the time on the ground, and who were men of learning, able to prove these miracles impositions?

ground where the events occurred, were not able to prove the miracles of Christ and his Apostles impositions. [1]Nor were they foolish enough to attempt it. So overwhelming was the evidence of these miracles, that those acute, learned, and inveterate enemies of Christ and christianity, Celsus, Porphyry and Julian, never pretended to deny that what we call miracles were actually performed; yet they attributed them to Satanic influence, or to magic.

We, as a nation, observe the 4th of July [2]as a day of rejoicing, commemorative of the declaration of the independence of these United States. Could this day have been so generally observed as commemorative of that event, if it had never occurred? Could Washington, or any other of our venerated statesmen, have published such a statement, and made this nation believe that we had once been bondmen, and that after a struggle of seven years we obtained deliverance—and enforce the observance of the 4th of July to commemorate it—if it had not really been so? [3]No man in his senses would pretend it.

The Jews, from the time of Moses, have a day [4]commemorative of their deliverance, from bondage in Egypt, by ten successive miracles. It is called the Passover. It originated in this manner:

1. Did they attempt it? Would they not have proved them false if they could? 2 Why do we celebrate the 4th of July? 3. Might not this day have been celebrated for such a purpose if we had always been free? 4 Why do the Jews celebrate the Passover? Does not the Passover then furnish as much evidence of the deliverance of the Jews from bondage, as does the 4th of July of our deliverance from Britain?

God commanded Pharaoh to let his people go. Pharaoh refused. Moses, by the command of God, performed one miracle after another to convince Pharaoh of his divine mission. Pharaoh grew more and more obstinate. The last miraculous plague was now about to be inflicted. The angel of destruction was to come down at midnight and proceed through all the land of Egypt, slaying the first born. A sign was given to the people of God. They were to kill a lamb and sprinkle its blood upon the posts of their doors as a token of their covenant relation with God, which, when seen by the angel, he was to *pass over* that house and not slay the first born. The angel passed through at midnight, when all was silent in the court of Pharaoh. The first born were slain; not one house was spared, save where the blood was sprinkled; there the destroyer entered not. [1]At that hour the Passover was celebrated, and has been from that day to this. [2]The Passover could no more have been instituted had this miraculous deliverance never occurred, than could the 4th of July have been celebrated if we had never fought for freedom.

Christians, also, have a commemorative ordinance —the *Lord's Supper*. [3]They have celebrated it for more than eighteen hundred years. [4]It is as much

---

1. When was the Passover instituted? 2. Is it reasonable to suppose that it could have been instituted if this deliverance had never taken place? 3. For how long time have christians celebrated the Lord's Supper? Was there ever a time when they could have begun to celebrate it if Jesus had not instituted it? 4. What is it evidence of?

evidence of the sufferings and death of Christ, as is the observance of the 4th of July of our former subjection to the British. It could never have been instituted unless the event had oocurred.

[1]The Jews who hated Christ and christians, acknowledge that Christ and his disciples performed numerous miracles, [2]in consequence of his having stolen the right pronunciation of the ineffible name of God, or of his practice of magic, which they say he learned in Egypt. The christian fathers, as Quadratus, Tertullian and Origin, in their controversies with their learned heathen antagonists, in the first, second and third centuries, refer them [3]to the miracles of Christ and his Apostles as undisputed facts, which [4]they certainly would not have done had it been in the power of these enemies to refute them.

There is no reason to dispute the miracles of Christ. Their number was very great,—[6]over forty recorded at large, and of almost every kind. [5]Imposters who pretend to work miracles, limit them to a very few, and of a particular species. [7]Christ gave sight to him who had been born blind, and the case was examined by his enemies. There could have been no deception. [7]He healed the leprosy;

---

1. Who acknowledge that Christ wrought miracles? 2. How do they vainly say that he obtained the power? 3. In their discussions with heathen philosophers to what do the early christian fathers refer? 4. How dare they do it? 5. Do imposters pretend to perform many miracles? 6. How many did Christ perform? 7. What was the nature of the miracles performed by Christ?

[7]cured the palsy when it had been of long standing; [7]gave limbs to those who had lost them; [7]restored demoniacs and those bereft of reason, to their right minds, instantly with a word; and [7]raised the dead to life at four different times, in the presence of his most inveterate enemies. [1]These very miracles were foretold by the prophet Isaiah seven hundred years before they were performed. [2]They were all performed in the most public manner, except one or two, where the reason for privacy was obvious. [3]Great numbers of those who witnessed them were convinced, notwithstanding their strong prejudices against christianity. The miracles of Christ and his Apostles continued to be performed [4]for *seventy years*, among the most learned and refined nations of the globe; and yet their reality was never denied. [5]"*This man doeth many miracles*," said the chief priests and Pharisees when they had assembled in council to consult what should be done with Jesus after he had raised Lazarus. John, 11: 47.

The limits of this little work will not allow me to protract the argument under this head any further than to notice some things in reference to the resurrection of Christ. This is the crowning argument for the truth of the christian religion and the Bible.

---

1. How long beforehand were these miracles predicted? 2. Were they not performed in secret or in the presence of a few select friends? 3. What effect was produced on those who witnessed them? 4. For how long a time did the Apostles continue to work miracles? 5. What did the chief priests and Pharisees acknowledge of Christ?

[1]The fact that there was such a man as Jesus Christ, and that he was put to death by order of the Roman Governor, need not be proved. [2]The whole proceedings were registered in the annals of the Roman Empire, and were often referred [3]to by the christian fathers who lived within two hundred years of Christ. The piercing his side by the soldier, and [4]the blood and water which issued from the wound, is full evidence that the sword penetrated the heart, and that he was truly dead, as they most fully believed.

[5]Another fact is equally certain—that in some way his body was missing. To this day, [6]the Jews affirm that his body was stolen by the disciples when the guard were asleep—a falsehood which [7]the chief priests had hired the guard to put in circulation.

[8]Christians believe that he arose from the dead. If he did not arise, [9]enemies or friends must have taken his body from the tomb. If enemies had taken it, [10]they surely would have exhibited it, to show that the story of his resurrection, which was put in immediate circulation, was false. It is evident that enemies did not take it.

Friends could *not* have taken it. [11]He was put to

---

1. Is it a fact that Jesus was put to death? 2. Where were the proceedings recorded? 3. When were they referred to? And by whom? 4. What proof that he was dead? 5. Was he missing from the tomb? 6. What do the Jews affirm? 7. How came this story to be reported? 8. What do christians believe? 9 If it was taken from the tomb who must have taken it? 10. Suppose enemies had taken it? 11. Why could not his friends have stolen it?

death by enemies, and his body was in their hands, and they used every precaution to keep it safely. "We remember," say they, "that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, 'After three days I will arise again,' command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, 'He is risen from the dead,' so the last error shall be worse than the first." And the sepulchre was made as sure as these wary and malignant chief priests could make it.

[1]The place where the body was deposited, was a vault hewn out of a solid rock, closed by a stone which fitted the apperture, and probably lay obliquely upon it. This was placed against the opening, or door, and [2]a body of sixty Roman soldiers were placed as sentinels to guard it. But to make it certain that these soldiers might not be bribed to let his body be taken away, [3]this stone was sealed, probably with the seal of the Governor, which could not be broken without detection. To remove this stone required the force of several men. According to accurate calculations, the Passover was celebrated at the time of full moon, at which time usually [5]a million of foreigners were in Jerusalem, and thousands were passing and repassing the sepulchre, which was [4]within half a mile of the city, every hour.

---

1. Where was it placed? 2. How guarded? 3. What was done to prevent the soldiers giving it up? 5. How many foreigners in Jerusalem at this time? 4. How far from Jerusalem?

Now is it conceivable, that the disciples, who were in jeopardy every moment lest they should be arrested as his friends, and stoned or crucified; and who were so fearful when he was alive and in danger, that *all* forsook him and fled, should now, he was dead, and all hopes of his being their deliverer blasted, all at once become so bold and daring as to attempt to steal his dead body in such an exposed situation, and when guarded by *sixty* Roman soldiers. [1]The supposition is absurd in the highest degree. But, say they, the guard were asleep. [2]How, then, did they know that the disciples stole him away. But it is by no means probable that sixty men on guard were asleep at one time, especially when it is known that [3]it was death for a Roman sentinel to sleep on his post. If, however, the disciples did steal him when the guard were asleep, why were not the disciples arraigned and these soldiers brought as the witnesses of their theft. Why no man lay hands upon them, when [4]they immediately and boldly declared on the very ground where he was condemned and crucified, that he was risen from the dead, and charged the guilt of murdering him upon the chief priests and elders.

The guard had never dared to acknowledge that they had been asleep, if true. And the only reason

1. Under such circumstances, is it probable that the disciples would attempt the theft? 2. Might not the guard have been asleep? 3. What was the consequence if a Roman sentinel slept? Is it not reasonable to suppose that they would have arrested the disciples if they could prove that they had stolen the body? Did they do it? 4. Did the disciples act like thieves?

why they dared to make this statement, being false, was that [1]the chief priests and elders *hired* them to do it, and promised to protect them if a knowledge of it should come to the ears of the Governor. "Say," said they, "his disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept, and if this come to the Governor's ears, we will persuade him and secure you." Math. 28: 11–13.

From what has been said, it is plain that the disciples could not have stolen his body. Nor would they if they could. [2]If he was not an imposter, he certainly would arise from the dead and go before them into Galilee; if he was, he would not arise, and it would be no object for them to steal the body of a vile imposter. It might much better lay in the tomb than for them to encumber themselves with it.

The *evidences of his resurrection are overwhelming.* [3]Eleven men of unimpeachable character bear witness of it. [4]They spend their lives, bereft of every earthly good, amid opposition and reproach, in declaring it, and finally, with one exception, were put to death for asserting it, and he, according to history, was cast into a caldron of boiling oil from which he escaped unhurt and lived to die a natural death.

---

1. If it was death for a Roman sentinel to sleep on his post, how dare the guard pretend that the disciples stole him away while they slept? 2. As they could not steal him if they would, is it reasonable to suppose they would if they could? 3. How many witnesses to Christ's resurrection? 4. What evidence to think them honest?

[1]The account which the apostles give, is perfectly clear and consistent. [2]They affirm that there was an earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven and rolled back the stone; that for fear of him, the keepers did shake and became as dead men. [3]They affirm that they had seen him, and knew it to be him, by the wounds in his hands and side. [4]*Great numbers* affirmed the same. [5]He appeared, bearing his wounds, at thirteen different times, during the [6]forty days that he remained on earth, after his resurrection. [7]Sometimes he was seen by one, or more, sometimes by all his disciples together. And on one occasion, by more than five hundred, (1 Cor. 15: 6,) the greater part of whom, were alive when these accounts were published. [8]Additional force is given to this testimony, from the fact that it was immediately given —given while their enemies were enraged, and Calvary was yet wet with the blood of their crucified Master. [9]Cowardly as they were three days before, they were as bold as lions after they had seen their Lord. [10]They went immediately to Jerusalem, where hundreds of thousands were collected, in the greatest tumult, and day after day, charged

---

1. What is said of the account given by the apostles? 2. What reason did they give why the keepers should not know that Christ had risen? 3. How did the apostles know that Christ had risen? 4. Did any body else know it? Affirmed what? 5. How many times was he seen? 6. How long did he remain on earth after his resurrection? 7. Was he seen by many at once? 8. What gives force to this testimony? 9. Did the apostles act as though they were sincere? 10. Where did they immediately go?

the murder of the Prince of glory, [1]upon the chief priests and rulers of the Jewish nation. [2]Nothing but the fullest conviction of the truth of what they declared, could have made these timid disciples so bold. [3]The evidence of Christ's resurrection was so conclusive to those who lived at that time, that vast multitudes, who rejected all the testimony to his divinity, furnished by his miracles during his life, were convinced by the evidence of his resurrection, and embraced the doctrine of the cross, though persecution and death awaited them.

An inquiry arises. [4]Why did he not go and show himself to the chief priests, the leaders in putting him to death, and then declare himself to be their murdered Messiah? Suppose he had, and the chief priests and Jewish nation had all believed on him. [5]Infidels had then said that it was a contrivance of the Jews, who were ready to believe any story that appeared to correspond with their notions of their long expected Messiah. Hence, [6]to the Gentiles, the evidence of his Messiahship had been far less convincing. Suppose they had disbelieved, as probably they would, then infidels had said, [7]Indeed, he did succeed in deceiving the weak and

1. Upon whom did they charge the murder of Christ? Would they not have punished the disciples if this charge had not been true? 2. What gave them such boldness? 3. What effect had the evidence of Christ's resurrection upon those who lived at the time? 4. What inquiry is supposed? 5. Suppose he had, and all the Jews had believed, what would infidels have said? 6. Would the Gentiles have been convinced of his Messiahship if the Jews had believed? 7. Suppose they had disbelieved, what had infidels said?

credulous, but the wise and learned detected his cheat and exposed his imposition.

Thus, as it is, [1]the evidence of his resurrection is far more satisfactory to the *world*, than though he had showed himself to the chief priests, and they had either believed or disbelieved.

11. [2]The *prophecies*, contained in the scriptures, evince them to be the word of God.

In its general acceptation, [3]prophecy is the knowing and foretelling events, which could not be discovered by the wisdom of men. [4]When uninspired men foretell events, which is often the case, it is merely the conjecture of things, in themselves probable; or, at best, casual coincidences, of the event with the prediction. [5]The heathen oracles were not prophecies, but merely ambiguous responses. If an individual wished to know what should be done in a particular crisis, he would send, or go, and inquire of the oracle. [6]The oracle was either a man or woman, professing to give the reply of the god consulted. And [7]the answer was such, or so worded, that it would correspond to the issue of the event, let it terminate as it would. As an illustration: [8]Trajan sent to the oracle to know if he should march against the Parthians, and should

---

1. Can we see any wisdom in his not showing himself to the chief priests and rulers? 2. What is the eleventh argument to prove that the scriptures are the word of God? 3. What is prophecy? 4. What do you say of the predictions of uninspired men? 5. What of the heathen oracles? 6. What were they? 7. Were definite answers returned? 8. What illustration is given?

be successful. The oracle sent back a vine, cut in pieces, which Trajan could interpret as he pleased. And if he, or the Parthians, were victorious, the divided vine had represented the fact, and proved the truth of the oracle.

[1]Scripture prophecies, though sometimes difficult to be understood, are in the main, clear predictions of definite and unmistakeable events, which could be foretold only by the spirit of omniscience. [2]*Man* has no knowledge of the future, only as he gains it by reason,—tracing cause and effect in their usual operation. [3]*Satan* has no more knowledge of the future, than man, only as he has superior wisdom and experience. [4]To consult man, or devil, in reference to our future destiny, is, therefore, a sin, which God in his word, has forbidden. It is to ascribe that wisdom, which *he alone* possesses, to finite beings, and is a species of idolatry.

The marks of the divine origin of the Bible, appear in every prophecy; and [5]united together the leading events of history, are clearly and fully traced. So much so, that [6]in every age, men have had their eyes turned towards important events, which, at the expiration of certain periods, from one hundred to six thousand years, they felt the fullest confidence would occur, and

1. The responses of heathen oracles were vague and indefinite, are not prophecies the same? 2. What knowledge of the future has man? 3. Has satan any more? 4. Is it right to consult either in reference to the future? 5. When the prophecies are united, what may be traced? 6. What proof that a prophetical history of the world has been given?

[1]none but fanciful interpreters, or visionary enthusiasts, have ever been disappointed.

[2]The strongest evidence that these events have been foretold, by men inspired of God, is that they were, in themselves, so *improbable*.

Those who are acquainted with the Bible, know full well, that it is predicted, and fully expected by the mass of believers in revelation, [3]that the entire population of the globe will be christianized. That the world, the whole world, will be brought into subjection to Christ. This prediction is found in a book that we *know* (see history of the Bible) was completed, and has remained without the addition of a *single letter*, for more than *two thousand years*. Previous to the translation of the scriptures into the Greek language, and until the last two hundred years, [4]no event could be more improbable, than that all nations should become christian, and [5]even now, those who disbelieve the Bible, do not believe it, though all the movements among nations and churches seem to denote it. What has there ever been, in the history of the world, to lead uninspired men to prophecy that the time would come, "when nations should learn *war* no more," when they should "beat their swords into plow shares,

---

1. Have they been disappointed? 2. What makes the evidence from prophecy so strong? 3. What great event is fully predicted and believed? 4. Was this event probable when this prediction was written by Mosos? 5. Do not disbelievers regard this as exceedingly improbable now?

and their spears into pruning hooks." [1]No uninspired man would have staked his reputation upon such an improbable prediction.

I can notice but one or two of the prophecies which strike my mind most forcibly, and perhaps shall pass those which are much more forcible to others.

### THE ARABS.

The Arabs, or [2]Saracens, the known and acknowledged descendants of [3]Ishmael, the son of Abraham, are living witnesses of the fulfillment of prophecy. [4]They occupy the same soil that they occupied three thousand years ago. [5]Many of the names of their places are the same now as when the Bible was written. They claim to be the descendants of Abraham, and practice [6]circumcision as do the descendants of that patriarch. It was written of Ishmael, three thousand years ago, [7]"that he should be a wild man, that his hand should be against every man, and every man's hand against him." It is well known, that the Arabs, though always engaged in warfare, have never been subdued. [8]Gibbon, the infidel historian, affirms that they are armed against mankind"—[9]"the arms of

1. Would uninspired men, judging from observation, have predicted a period when war would be unknown? 2. By what other names are the Arabs known in history? 3. From whom were they descended? 4. What land do they occupy? What its name? 5. What is said of the names of their places? 6. What religious rite do they practice, which proves their claim to be the descendants of Abraham? 7. What was written of Ishmael three thousand years ago? 8. Whose testimony proves this prophecy true? 9. Who have tried to subdue them? Why could they not?

Sesostris, of Cyrus, of Pompey, and of Trajan, could never achieve the conquest of Arabia." Their continued independence would have seemed altogether improbable, to uninspired men, attempting to forge the Bible. Who would have thought Egypt, Persia, Babylon, Greece and Rome had fallen, and Arabia remained free?

Three hundred and fifty years before [1]Josiah was born, his name was announced by the prophet, and [2]the work he should accomplish, distinctly specified. [3]Compare 1 Kings, 13: 2, with 2 Kings, 23: 15, 16.

### AMMON.

[4]The whole country of the *Ammonites*, according to Ezekiel, was to become a "perpetual desolation;" its chief city, "Rabbah, a stable for camels," "a couching place for flocks." Ezek. 25: 2, 5. [5]Modern travellers testify that the whole country, once so flourishing and populous, is now one vast desert. [6]*Rabbah* is called by the same name by which it was known three thousand years ago, and its ruins used [7]as a shelter for their camels and flocks.

### EDOM.

[8]*Edom* was to be laid waste, and her cities to be

1. Whose name is mentioned three hundred and fifty years before he was born? 2. What is specified concerning him? 3. How do you prove this? 4. What prediction is made concerning Ammon? 5. What do modern travellers say of it? 6. What is said of Rabbah? 7. For what are its ruins used? How long since this prophecy was uttered? (Answer. More than two thousand years.) 8. What were the prophecies concerning Edom, and where do you find them?

inhabited by wild beasts. Isai. 34: 10–17. Jer. 49: 7–10, 12–18. Ezek. 35: 1–15. [1]Volney, a disbeliever in the Bible, speaking of these ruins, yet ignorant of the prophecy, the truth of which he proves, says: "The Arabs sometimes make use of them to fodder their cattle in; but, *in general, avoid them,* [2]*on account of the enormous scorpions with which they swarm.*"

[3]The prophecies in scripture, respect nearly all the nations existing at the time they were written, and are all most minutely fulfilled. I will mention Babylon and Jerusalem, as they are standing witnesses of the truth of scripture, and the predictions respecting them, were in the highest degree *improbable,* such as would not have been made by sensible uninspired men.

### BABYLON.

*Two hundred years* before an enemy, except captives, had passed the threshold of her brazen gates, and not far from the time when her haughty monarch defied the God of Israel before the walls of Jerusalem, Isaiah predicted the destruction of *Babylon.* Isai. 13: 1–22. [4]"Behold, I will stir up the Medes against them, which shall not regard silver; and as for gold, they shall not delight in it.

---

1. What does Volney say that proves the truth of the scriptures? 2. Why do the Arabs avoid these ruins? 3. Are the prophecies numerous? 4. What prophecy is found in Isai. 13: 1–22, concerning Babylon? Is this language plain to be understood?

. . . . And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall *never* be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the *Arabian pitch tent there;* neither shall the shepherds make their folds there; But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures, and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there, and the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant places, and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged." [1]At the time when this, and other prophecies respecting her, were uttered, Babylon was increasing in greatness, and continued to increase for many years; nations were subjugated on every side. [2]The Medes spoken of, were but an inconsiderable people. There is as much prospect that the Liberians will subdue England, as there was that the Medes would subdue Babylon. No city in history has been more renowned for strength and capability of resisting the enemy. The city was [3]fifteen miles square, surrounded by walls [4]three hundred and fifty feet high and eighty-seven feet thick, made of brick, cemented with bitumen, which, when dried,

---

1. Was there any prospect that Babylon would be destroyed, when this prediction was uttered? 2. Was there any probability that it would be destroyed by the Medes? 3. How large was the city of Babylon? 4. How high and thick was the wall with which Babylon was surrounded?

was as hard as stone, and outside of the wall was [1]an immense ditch, from which the earth had been taken for the walls, which was always filled with water. Her strength was no protection; [2]God had determined her overthrow, and prophecy had declared it. 1. [3]Different nations are represented (v. 4) as going against her. "The noise of a multitude in the mountains, like as a great people, a tumultuous noise of the kingdoms of *nations* gathered together; the Lord of hosts mustereth the host of the battle." Jer. 50: 9. [4]Xenophon, the Greek historian, gives this account: [5]"Cyrus, a Mede, with a small body of Persians, succeeding to the throne of the Medes, united under his command, the Hyrcanians, Lydians, Phrygians, Cappadocians and other nations, and marched against Babylon with an immense army of [6]one hundred and twenty thousand horse, two thousand chariots, and six hundred thousand foot." 2. On another occasion, the same prophet, two hundred years before Babylon was destroyed, announces the name of its destroyer—Cyrus. [7]"Thus saith the Lord to his annointed, to *Cyrus*, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates, (of Babylon,) and the gates shall not be shut."

---

1. What was outside of the wall? 2. How could Babylon be taken when so strongly fortified? 3. What is the first point clearly expressed in the prophecies concerning her? 4. By whom is this proved to be true? 5. What does he say? 6. How large was the army? 7. What does Isaiah say two hundred years before the destruction of Babylon?

Isai. 45: 1. 3. [1]The name of the principal nation is announced—Media—then scarcely ranked among the nations. "Behold, I will stir up the Medes," v. 17. 4. Another prophet, almost a hundred years later than Isaiah, and more than a hundred before the events occurred, also mentions the nations that should come against Babylon, and the time of their coming. [2]*She was to fall during the time of a feast.* Thus reads the prophecy: "In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord." Jer. 51: 39 and 57. [3]In the fifth chapter of Daniel, who [4]was present when the city was taken, we are informed that [5]"Belshazzar, the king, made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand." He impiously, with his princes, wives and concubines, drank wine out of the golden vessels which his father had taken from the house of God in Jerusalem. "They drank wine and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone. In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick, upon the plaster of the wall of the kings palace," these words, "MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN," which is interpreted, "God hath num-

1. What other circumstance is distinctly specified by Isaiah? 2 What particular circumstance is mentioned by Jeremiah one hundred years before the event? 3. Where do we find proof that she fell during a feast? 4. How did Daniel know any thing about the taking of Babylon? 5. What does he say? Read the account.

bered thy kingdom, and finished it; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." "In that night, was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans, slain." [1]The account given by the Greek historian, Herodotus, is substantially the same. [2]When Cyrus entered the city, "on the night of one of their great festivals, many of them were asleep, many drunk, and universal confusion reigned. It was midnight. The voluptuous citizens, in the greatest security, were engaged in dancing and merriment."

[3]Babylon was to be taken by surprise and stratagem. According to the historian above named, Cyrus, with his immense army, laid siege [4]for two full years in vain. They could make no breach in such mighty walls; and there was no prospect of reducing them by famine, for [5]they had provisions sufficient to last them twenty years, and felt perfectly secure, trusting to the strength of their walls. But, says God, by the prophet, [6]"*I have laid a snare for thee, O Babylon, and thou wast not aware.*" Jer. 50: 24. The Euphrates, [7]a quarter of a mile wide and twelve feet deep, ran [8]through

---

1. Some reject the testimony of Daniel, and would prefer the testimony of a heathen; can it be had? What is the testimony of Herodotus? 3. What other remarkable and peculiar circumstance is mentioned in the prophecy? What proof of this? (Herodotus.) 4. How long did Cyrus lay siege in vain to the city? 5. Why could they not surround them and subdue them by starvation? 6. What does God say by the prophet? 7. How wide and deep was the river Euphrates. 8. Where did it run?

the centre of the city. [1]Cyrus turned the course of this river, by digging a channel for it around the walls of the city, unbeknown to the Babylonians,—[2]"A drought is upon her waters, and they shall be dried up," Jer. 50: 38,—leaving its original bed dry, through which his soldiers, in two divisions, entered the city in opposite directions. Then [3]"one post," [sentinel,] being stationed where the river entered the city, did "run to meet another," stationed where the river left the city, each ignorant of what had taken place at the opposite side, "to show the king of Babylon that his city is taken at one end, and that the passages are stopped, and the reeds they have burned with fire, and the men of war they are affrighted." Jer. 51: 31, 32. And such was the haste with which these divisions of the army of Cyrus rushed through the city, according to Herodotus, that the drunken inhabitants knew no danger, "till the moment they were slain." [4]The soldiers came even to the palace, and burst open the doors, before the king had learned that they had entered the city.

The present condition of Babylon, as fully testifies to the truth of prophecy, as its destruction. [5]"*It shall never be inhabited,*" says the prophecy,

---

1. What stratagem did Cyrus use? 2. What prophecy was fulfilled when the bed of the river was turned? 3. What, when the army of Cyrus entered the city in opposite directions, through the dry channel of the river, and the affrighted sentinels ran to tell the king that the city was taken? 4. How did the king first learn that the city was taken? 5. What prophecy relates to the present condition of Babylon?

*"neither shall Arabian pitch tent there." "Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling place for dragons, an astonishment, and a hissing, without inhabitants."* [1]A recent traveller remarks, "I am totally incapable of conveying an adequate idea of the dreary, lonely nakedness that appeared before me; and there reigns throughout the ruins a silence as profound as the grave." "*Neither shall Arabian pitch tent there.*" Though [2]it is common in the east for shepherds to shelter their flocks in ruined edifices, yet [3]such a dread and fear of the ruins of Babylon prevails, that an Arab cannot be prevailed upon, on any consideration, to spend one night there. Travellers, wishing to remain, in order to see the ruins more fully in the morning, have tried *in vain* to hire their Arab guides to stay with them. [4]They fancy that these ruins, in a particular manner, are haunted by evil spirits! "*Wild beasts of the desert shall lie there.*" [5]"Owls and bats, in vast numbers, lodge in its numerous caverns; porcupines, hyenas, jackalls and lions make their dens among the ruins." Its mighty walls [6]have been mostly carried off to build other cities, though piles, eighty feet high, are still remaining.

1. What does a recent traveller say? 2. What is common in the east? 3. Are the ruins of Babylon used for that purpose? 4. Why will not Arab guides remain over night with travellers? 5. Prophecy declares, that the wild beast of the desert shall lie there: do travellers confirm it? 6. What have become of the walls of Babylon

JUDEA.

[1] "The generation to come of your children, that shall rise up after you, and the *stranger*, that shall come from a far land, shall say, when they see the plagues of that land, and the sicknesses which the Lord hath laid upon it, . . . . Wherefore hath the Lord done this unto the land? What meaneth the heat of this great anger?" Deut. 29: 22, 24. [2]The infidel, Volney, little thought that he was proving the truth of scripture, when he exclaimed, whilst gazing upon the ruins of Judea, (Volney's ruins, ch. 11, p. 8,) [3]"Good God, from whence proceeds such melancholy revolutions? for what cause is the fortune of these countries so *strikingly changed?* Why are so many cities destroyed? Why is not that ancient population reproduced and perpetuated? . . . . . I wandered over the country—I traverse the provinces—I enumerated the kingdoms of Damascus and Judea, of Jerusalem and Samaria. This Syria, *said I to myself, now* almost depopulated, *then* contained a *hundred* flourishing cities, and abounded with towns, villages and hamlets. What are become of so many productions of the hands of man? What are become of those ages of abundance and of life?" &c. Had he been less ignorant of prophecy, he might have traced the

1. What does Moses predict concerning the desolation of the land, and of the inquiry of after generations and strangers? 2. Who literally fulfilled this prediction? 3. What is his language?

hand of that God whom he despised, and learned the truth of his holy word.

### JERUSALEM AND THE JEWS.

[1]The prophecies concerning the Jews were very numerous, and contain their whole history, from Moses to the millennium. [2]All their numerous oppressions were foretold long before they came upon them, in the most explicit language. I can mention only a few, pertaining to the final destruction of their city and temple, and their present condition. [3]Moses first predicted their overthrow by the Romans, and minutely described the character of that then unknown nation. Deut. 28: 15–68. "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth, a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand, a nation of fierce countenance, which shalt not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young." Men, women and children were butchered in vast numbers, indiscriminately, in the destruction of Jerusalem. "And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, . . . and thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body . . . in the straitness of the siege, . . . . . [4]the tender and delicate women among you, which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground, for delicateness and tenderness, her

1. What do the prophecies concerning the Jews contain? 2. What was expressly foretold? 3. Who first predicts their overthrow? 4. What unnatural and awful event does he predict?

eyes shall be evil . . . . towards the children which she shall bear, for *she shall eat them*, for want of all things, secretly in the siege, and straitness wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates." Unnatural and shocking as it may appear, [1]this did actually take place at three different times during their history. [2]The first time, six hundred years after it was uttered, in the siege of Samaria. 2 Kings, 6: 25–29. Again during the siege of Jerusalem, by Nebuchadnezzar, and again, as minutely described by Josephus, when the city was destroyed by the Romans. [See Josephus's wars of the Jews, B. 6.] Here he gives an account of one Mary, a lady of rank and wealth, roasting and eating the half of her suckling son, one day, and reserving the other half for another day!

The limits of this little work will not allow me even to quote the numerous prophecies concerning this people. See Lev. 26: 33–44; Deut. 4: 27, and 28: 15–68, and 29th ch.; Isai. 6: 10–12; Jer. 9: 16; 15: 7; 29: 18; 31: 10; 46: 27; Ezek. 5:; 7:; 12:; Amos, 9:; Hos. 9:.

*Jerusalem* was to be destroyed, and their sanctuary laid waste. According to the prediction of our Savior, one stone was not to be left upon another. Jerusalem was destroyed [3]by the besieging army of Titus, composed of [4]sixty thousand Roman soldiers,

1. Was this dreadful prediction fulfilled? 2. When? 3. By whom was Jerusalem besieged? 4. How large was his army?

after a siege of [1]six months, and in which [2]more than a million and a half of Jews, amid unparalleled sufferings, perished. This took place only [3]*thirty-seven* years after our Savior had said, [4]"this generation shall not pass away before one stone shall not be left upon another." But it seems wonderfully improbable that "one stone should not be left upon another." And yet it was so; [5]great as was the labor of tearing up those massy walls, it was cheerfully done by the soldiers, at the command of Titus, in search of the gold which the Jews, during the siege, had buried beneath them. A few years afterwards, [6]Terrentius Rufus, undesignedly fulfilling another prophecy, Jer. 26: 18, plowed the ground on which the city stood. Several attempts have been made to rebuild the temple. One especially by [7]Julian, an apostate from christianity, with the avowed purpose of frustrating prophecy, which declared, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Luke, 21: 24. [8]He invited all the Jews throughout his empire to come to Jerusalem, promising to restore their religion and the temple. Multitudes accepted the invitation, and commenced the

1. How long did the siege last? 2. How many Jews were slain? 3. How long after the crucifixion of Christ did this take place? 4. What was his prediction? 5. Was the prediction,—"one stone shall not be left upon another,"—fulfilled? 6. It was predicted by Jeremiah, that Zion should be plowed as a field. Was that ever done? 7. Jerusalem was to be trodden down of the gentiles, until the times of the gentiles were fulfilled. Who attempted to defeat this prophecy by building up Jerusalem? 8. What did he do?

work with the greatest zeal and energy. But, [1]according to the testimony of numerous heathen writers, especially that of Ammianus Marcellinus, Julian's intimate friend, "fearful balls of fire, bursting from the ground, forced them to desist." *We* know that they did desist, and no other reason is assigned for it.

The Jews were to be *scattered* over the world—there is not a nation on the globe where they are not found. They were to be a *distinct* people—they are an anomaly in this respect. The identity of all other conquered nations has soon been destroyed—their's remains, though scattered over the world. They were to be made a *by-word and a hissing;* the name of *Jew*, in every land, and in every age, has been a name of reproach. [2]Nations have united in insulting and oppressing that once highly honored people—the depositaries, for many ages, of God's revealed will. They have been disinherited, and disfranchised—forbidden to own lands, hold office, give in their testimony under oath, or to bequeath property. "The Jews were every where," says Hallam, [Middle Ages, p. 468,] "the objects of popular insult and oppression." "It was the custom at Toulouse, to give a blow on the face to a Jew, every Easter." At "Beziers, they attacked the houses of Jews with stones, from Palm

1. Why did not they succeed? Has prophecy been fulfilled respecting their being scattered over the world—remaining a distinct people—being made a by-word and a hissing? 2. How have they been treated by all nations?

Sunday to Easter." *They were to be offered in market, and have none to buy them*—so much would they be despised. [1]Ninety-seven thousand, according to Josephus, were offered in market, after the siege of Jerusalem, for many of whom no purchasers could be found. Thus were that people, who were once the most honored of the nations, and the terror of the whole earth, despised. As though they were only fit for the slaughter, [2]thousands were thrown into the amphitheatre, in savage sport, to see them contend with wild beasts. [3]Two thousand five hundred were thus destroyed on one of the birth days of the emperor Domitian.

*False Christs* and *false prophets were to arise,* Mark, 13: 22, and [4]they did arise. Simon Magus, Dositheus and Theudas, were among the numerous imposters who appeared before the city was destroyed. Even during the siege of the Romans, [5]false prophets continually prophesied deliverance, incited the Jews to resistance to their own destruction. *Great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs from heaven.* Luke, 21: 11. [6]Tacitus and Josephus unite in affirming that there were

---

1. Were they, as prophecy affirms, ever offered in market without a purchaser? 2. What was done at the festivals of their conquerors? 3. How many were there destroyed on one of the birth days of Dometian? 4. What may be said of the appearance of false Christs and false prophets before the destruction of Jerusalem? 5. What made the Jews so obstinate? 6. What evidence have we that earthquakes and famines and pestilences and fearful sights, preceded the destruction of the city, according to our Savior's prophecy?

"famines, pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places." There were fearful sights and signs from heaven. [1]A star resembling a sword, according to Josephus, hung over the city for the space of a whole year. In the eighth day of the month Nisan, [1]in the ninth hour of the night, a great light, making it as bright as day, shone round the temple, and lasted for half an hour. [1]The eastern gate of the temple, made of brass, and which required the strength of twenty men to open and shut it, when unbolted, unbolted and opened of itself, about the sixth hour of the night. [1]In broad daylight, charriots, and troops of soldiers in their armor, were seen running about among the clouds and surrounding cities. At the feast of Pentecost, the priests heard a great shaking, and noise, and finally the voice, as of a multitude, saying, "Let us remove hence." [2]Jesus, the son of Ananus, who was thought mad, went through the city, and on the walls, crying incessantly for seven years and five months, without growing hoarse, "Wo, wo, to Jerusalem." He was often caught and whipped almost to death, but no other words could be extorted from him, either by friends or enemies. After the siege commenced, he kept on the walls continually, crying, "Wo, wo, to Jerusalem, to the people, and to the holy house;" and last he added,

---

1. What signs does Josephus mention? Why did not this sword terrify them? Many thought it foretokened the destruction of the Romans. 2. What is said of Jesus the son of Ananus?

"Wo, wo, to myself, also," when a stone, out of one of the engines of the Romans, smote and killed him. [Josephus's Wars of the Jews B. 6., ch. 5, § 3.]

When the Roman army surrounded the holy city, then that remarkable prophecy, in the first twenty-eight verses of the twenty-fourth of Matthew, was fulfilled: "*There shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.*" v. 21. [1]Three millions of people were in the city, it being at [2]the feast of the Passover. Every thing was favorable to the Romans. [3]The fiercest dissensions prevailed in the city. Before the enemy appeared, the blood of thousands had been shed, and the provisions, which might have sustained them in the siege, destroyed by each other in their civil war. [4]So bent were they upon mutual destruction, that they could scarcely take time to repel the enemy, which had easily been done, had they been united.

[5]The dead, which at first were buried from the public treasury, were soon so numerous, that they were thrown, by thousands, over the walls of the city, to prevent their breeding pestilence within it; but finally, they were left unburied in the streets, or dragged away into garrets or chambers; so that

---

1. How many people were in the city during the siege? 2. Why so many? 3. What made the taking of Jerusalem so favorable to the Romans? 4. Why were not the Romans driven from the walls? 5. What was done with the dead?

the living marched over heaps of the dead and dying, to fight their brethren, or the Romans. And, when finally the city was taken, the hardened Roman soldiers were shocked at the awful sight of innumerable dead bodies stowed away in the upper parts of the houses. [1]Such an amount of concentrated misery, Josephus repeatedly declares, the world, in his day, had never witnessed; and surely it never has witnessed it since; [2]"*no, nor never shall be.*"

Though Christ had predicted such awful destruction upon the Jews, he declared to his disciples, [3]"there shall not a hair of your heads perish." One million one hundred thousand Jews perished during the siege, either by famine, pestilence, or by the sword, in Jerusalem alone. And yet, according to credible historians, not a single christian perished. The Savior had given them a signal, how long to remain in the city, and no longer. [4]"When ye see the abomination of desolations, standing where it ought not, then let him that is on the house top not come down." [5]Whilst the Roman general, Cestius Gallus, was besieging the city with the best success, he *suddenly*, and *unexpectedly, without the least occasion, retreated* in great confusion, thus giving the christians, who saw and believed the signal,

---

1. What does Josephus declare? 2. What had Christ said? Was Josephus a christian? He was not. 3. What does he say to his disciples? 4. What sign had he given them? 5. How could they make their escape when the city was surrounded by the Roman army?

which their Lord had given them, an opportunity to escape. [1]Josephus says that many of the Jews, of rank and wealth, did escape. [Josephus's Wars, B. 6., 19.

### PROPHECIES CONCERNING CHRIST.

These are exceeding numerous and specific. [2]The nation, not only, but the family and tribe from which he was to descend, are named—the nation of Israel, the tribe of Judah, the family of David. [2]The country and town is named—Bethlehem Ephratah. Micah. 5: 2. [2]His flight into Egypt —his dwelling at Nazareth, and his being called a Nazarene in consequence of it—[2]his reproach and sufferings, from both Jews and Gentiles—[2]his being sold for thirty pieces of silver—[2]the manner of his sufferings—"They pierced my hands and my feet." Ps. 22: 16. [2]His silence under them, Isai. 53: 7—their offering him vinegar and gall to drink, Ps. 22: 15—and mocking him on the cross, Ps. 22: 7—and casting lots for his garment, Ps. 22: 18, Mark, 15: 24—and burying him in the tomb of the rich man, Isai. 53: 9—and his rising from the dead on the third day—were all subjects of prophecy, many hundred, and some of these particulars, thousands of years before his memorable sufferings on Calvary.

---

1. How far does the testimony of Josephus go to prove this? 2. What events in the history of Christ were minutely foretold?

12. [1] *The agreement* among the sacred writers, shows that they were under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Bible was written by different men, under different circumstances, in different ages. [2] Fifteen hundred years, at least, elapsed between the writing of different portions of the word of God. And yet [3] they all teach the same great truths—all unite in one grand object. It certainly is inconceivable, [4] that men, living from five to fifteen hundred years apart, would unite in carrying out any piece of deception, but especially *such an one*, when, to engage in it, were self-destruction. And had it been attempted, [5] every succeeding imposter had thought that he could make some improvement of the plan of his predecessor, until, between the last and first writer, all harmony would cease. [6] Mahomet was a great imposter, and yet his last writings taught very differently, on many subjects, from his first. So of "Joe Smith." [7] The Bible teaches the same truths from first to last.

13. [8] Bible facts are corroborated by profane history, tradition, &c.

[9] Imposters never state facts, with time, place and

---

1. What is the 12th argument for the divinity of the scriptures? Being written by so many different men who lived in periods so remote from each other, would there have been such a perfect agreement if the writers had not been inspired by the same spirit? 2. What length of time elapsed between the writing of different portions of scripture? 3. Wherein do they agree? 4. What supposition is absurd? 5. What had been the case suppose it had been commenced by the originator? 6. Do all the teachings of impositors harmonize? 7. What does the Bible teach? 8. What is the 13th argument for the truth of the Bible? 9. Wherein do the writings of impositors differ from the Bible?

circumstances, so as to place it in the power of their enemies to refute them.

The Bible, on the contrary, with a frankness that courts investigation, relates facts just as they occurred, with the time and place, and refers [1]to witnesses who were alive when the accounts were written.

Other facts are corroborated [2]by tradition and history, preserved among heathen nations. *The creation* is shown to have taken place, according to the Mosaic record, from the traditions concerning the chaotic mass from which the world was formed, as found [3]among the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Phenicians, Hindoos, Chinese, Greeks, and American Indians. The division of time into *weeks* of seven days each, is shown to be of divine appointment, from its prevalence over the globe. We can account for the division of time into years, months and days from the annual, and diurnal revolution of the sun, and revolution of the moon. But how came the nations of the earth, so generally, to make this entirely arbitrary division of time into weeks of seven days each? [4]Most evidently it is to be traced to the tradition of the creation, and of God's resting on the seventh day.

[5]The *formation* of man in a state of *purity*, is

1. To what does the Bible refer to prove its statements? 2. How are Bible facts corroborated? 3. Do we find accounts of the creation elsewhere than in the Bible? 4. How came time to be universally divided into weeks of seven days each? 5. Is there any intimation in the traditions of the heathen, that man was originally created holy?

traced through heathen tradition, to its origin, as related by Scripture. [5]The Hindoos speak of an age of perfection. [5]The Greeks and Romans to one of gold. [5]The glowing description of the garden of the Hesperides, where all manner of delicious fruits abounded, and which was guarded by an awful dragon, so noted in classic song, is borrowed from Paradise.

[1]The *fall* of *man*, and the introduction of evil, seems to be alluded to in the fable of Pandora and her box, which, contrary to the command of Jupiter, prompted by curiosity, she opened, when out flew all the evils that affect the world, hope only remaining at the bottom. [2]That man had fallen, was taught by the ancient Greeks and Romans, and is taught by the modern brahmins. [3]The extreme age to which the antedeluvians lived, is attested by Manetho, the Egyptian historian, by Berosus, the Chaldean, by Hessiod and Ephorus, as quoted by Josephus. [4]He also mentions a number of writers who speak of the *deluge*, besides, almost every nation have some tradition respecting it. [5]Deucalian's flood, as mentioned by Ovid, Plutarch and Lucian, heathen writers, is evidently the flood mentioned by Moses. [6]Lucian speaks of the race which preceded the flood, as "exceedingly wicked and corrupt,—that

1. Any of his fall, and the introduction of sin into the world? 2. Who taught that man had fallen? 3. Do profane writers substantiate the account of the extreme age of the antedeluvians? 4. Is any account given of the deluge elsewhere than in the Bible? 5. What of Deucalian's flood? 6. Is there any resemblance in the account given by Lucian and Moses?

on account of their wickedness, they were destroyed, whilst Deucalian and his family, on account of his piety, was preserved by building an ark, in which, also, pairs of all creatures upon the earth entered, and lived in friendship and were saved." Lucian, who gives this account, says he got it from the Grecians. [1]Berosus, the Chaldean, as Josephus in his controversy with his enemy Apion, B. I. § 19, affirms, speaks of the flood, and tells where the ark rested, and gives a catalogue of the descendants of Noah. [2]This statement of Josephus had been refuted, had it been in the power of an enemy to do it.

The *tower* of *Babel*, and the destruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, are mentioned by heathen writers. [3]Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Tacitus and Josephus, confirm the scripture account.

[4]The real existence of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is attested by Hecateus, who, as Josephus affirms, wrote a book concerning Abraham, which was extant in his time.

[5]The departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and their passage of the Red Sea, is mentioned by heathen writers of great antiquity, and the present inhabitants on the coast, preserve a tradition of it, and call the sea, on account of it, "the *Sea* of *Destruction*."

---

1. Have the Chaldeans any record of the flood? 2. Is it certain that this statement of Josephus was true? What reason to think so? 3 What writers besides Moses mentions the tower of Babel, and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah? 4. Modern infidels have said that there never was such persons as Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob; is there any proof of their having existed? 5. Is there any evidence other than the Bible that the Israelites ever escaped from Egypt and passed through the Red Sea?

Almost every important event in the Bible, is mentioned by heathen writers.

[1]Most of the names of countries and places, in ancient geography, can be traced as receiving their name from the early descendants of Noah. For example: [2]Tiras, or Thiras, the son of Japheth, the son of Noah, was the father of the Thracians, or the inhabitants of Thrace. From [3]Madai, the second son of Japheth, came the Medes of Media. [4]The Galatians were formerly called Gomerits, from the third son of Japheth. [5]The ancient Ionians came from Javan, written by the Greeks, Iouan. [6]From Ashur came the Assyrians; from Aram, his grandson, the Armenians.

New Testament facts are even more fully corroborated by profane writers, than those recorded in the Old Testament; because there were more writers in the age when the events recorded in the New Testament, took place.

[7]Accounts of Christ, of his sufferings and death, were recorded in the *annals of the Roman nation*, and were referred to by [8]Justin Martyr, in his *Apology for the Christians*, addressed to the emperor and senate of Rome, one hundred and ten years af-

---

1. Of what use are the many hard names found in the Bible? 2. Who was the father of the Thracians? 3. Of the Medes? 4. What was the origin of the inhabitants of Galatia? 5. Of Ionia? 6. From whom did the Assyrians and Armenians descend? 7. Was there ever such a person as Jesus Christ, and did he suffer under Pontius Pilate? 8. How do we get a knowledge of this fact?

ter the ressurrection of Christ. Says he, [1]"That these things were so done, you may know from the *Acts* made in the time of Pontius Pilate." [2]Tertullian, in his *Apology*, points the dignitaries of the Roman nation to the same record, and affirms, moreover, [3]that such was the exalted opinion of Christ, entertained by the emperor Tiberius, that he proposed to the senate to have Christ enrolled among the gods of the nation, within six years of his resurrection, which, however, [4]the senate refused, because the emperor had declined that honor. Tiberius carried the matter so far as to threaten punishment to the accusers of the christians.

[5]It were as wise to deny that there has been such a man as Washington, or Columbus, as to deny that there existed such a personage as Jesus of Nazareth. [6]To prove his existence, his enemies only need to be called upon the stand. [7]Suetonius, a heathen, who wrote his history about eighty-six years after the resurrection, says, "Claudius Cæsar expelled the Jews from Rome, because they raised continual tumults at the instigation of Christ." Many other heathen writers mention him by name, some out of ridicule, some to justify the Romans in their cruelty to Jews and christians.

---

1. What does he say? 2. Who else besides Justin Martyr refers to these records? What has become of them?—[Unknown; probably destroyed by the Goths and Vandals when Rome was destroyed.] 3. What remarkable fact does Tertullian affirm? 4. Why was not this done? 5. Can we consistently deny that there was such a person as Jesus Christ? 6. By whom can we prove his existence? 7. What does Suetonius say?

Ælius Lampridius, another Roman historian, relates that the [1]emperor Severus, "wished to erect a temple to Christ and to receive him among the gods, [2]but was forbidden by those consulting the oracle, they having found, if that was done, all men would become christians, and the other temples would be forsaken."

*The sufferings endured by early christians.* [3]If we deny them we must deny the truth of all history. Roman history contains as much evidence on this point as any can desire.

[4] *Tacitus,* speaking of the christians, says: "The author of that sect was Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius was punished with death, as a criminal, by the pro-consul Pontius Pilate. [5]But this pestilent superstition, though checked for a while, broke out afresh, not only in Judea, where the evil first originated, but even in the city, [of Rome.] At first those only were apprehended, who confessed themselves of that sect; afterwards a *vast multitude* discovered by them; all of whom were condemned. [6]Some were covered over with the skins of wild beasts, that they might be torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; while others, having been daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights, in the night time, and thus burnt to

1. Who else wished to have a temple erected to Christ? 2. Why did he not do it? 3. Modern infidels have said that the statements of the early christians, and their dreadful sufferings, were false—can we prove them true? 4. What great Roman historian furnishes us with sufficient testimony on this point? 5. What does he say of the number of christians? 6. Of their sufferings?

death." [1]Tacitus wrote this account within seventy or eighty years of the death of Christ. [2]Pliny, about the time when the history of Tacitus was written, wrote a letter to the emperor Trajan, by whom he was commissioned to execute christians; in which [3]he urges the emperor to lenity, on the ground of expediency, as the destruction of such a vast multitude of christians would weaken the strength of his empire. [4]For the superstition (as christianity was called) had seized cities not only, but lesser towns also, and the open country."

[5]Celsus, in one of the bitterest attacks that was ever made against christianity, in the latter part of the second century, calls all the apostles by name, acknowledges the miracles of Christ—speaks of his being born of a virgin—of his being worshipped by the wise men—of his fleeing into Egypt—of the slaughter of the infants by Herod—of the baptism of Christ by John—of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him—of his being counted a prophet by his disciples—and of his foretelling who should betray him, and the circumstances of his death and resurrection, and that he appeared to his disciples afterwards. [6]He *never* disputes the reality of his performing what we call miracles, but says they were

---

1. When does Tacitus give this account? 2. What other heathen writer besides Tacitus? 3. What was the substance of Pliny's letter? [See Pliny's letter to Trajan in Horne's Introduction.] 4. How extensively spread was christianity now, eighty years after the crucifixion? 5. What proof of the truth of christianity and the Bible, is furnished by Celsus? 6. Does he ever dispute the reality of Christ's miracles?

performed by the power of magic, which he learned in Egypt. [Lardner, quoted by Horne.]

[1]All authentic history so far as it touches upon points mentioned in the Bible, perfectly harmonizes with it. [2]No document of any kind contradicts, or materially differs from the accounts given in the Bible, or those which christians generally receive as true.

[3]All the objections of cavilers have been refuted over and over again. [4]No fresh objection has been started to the Bible for more than a thousand years. [4]All the quibbles of modern infidels, were in the mouths of those who lived within five hundred years of Christ, and have been shown to be without the least foundation ten thousand times. [5]Cavilers seldom read the argument in defence of the Bible.—[6]They are quick to see its apparent discrepancies, *but slow* to perceive its harmony, and the strength of its defence. [7]Many read the statements of Volney, Hume, Voltaire, and Paine, which are *utterly untrue*, but never read such works as Paley, or Alexander's Evidences of Christianity, Faber's Difficulties of Infidelity, Locke's, Addison's, Campbell's, Sherlock's, Lyttleton's, West's, Leslie's, Lardner's, Porter's, Beatie's, Soame Jenyn's, Jones's, or Bur-

---

1. Wherein does profane history and the Bible harmonize? 2. Does any history contradict the Bible? 3. Why have the objections of infidels not been silenced? 4. Have modern infidels made any new objections to religion? 5 Why have they not been convinced? 6. Which are they the most ready to see, the harmony, or the apparent discrepancies of the Bible? 7. Which are they the most ready to read, infidel or christian writers?

net's Evidences of Christianity, Newton, or Keith on Prophecy, Stackhouse's History of the Bible, Horne's Introduction, Vol. 1, Jew's letters to Voltaire, Prideaux's Connection, Paley's Natural Theology, &c., without number; the argument, in almost any one of which, would convince a man on any other subject.

---

## ARTICLE III.

### The Fall of Man — Its Consequences.

"So God created man in his own image, [1]in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them." Gen. 1: 27. "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed, (ch. 2: 8,) saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." v. 16, 17. "And when the woman saw that the fruit was good for food, . . . . she took of the fruit thereof and did eat." Ch. 3: 6. "And the Lord said unto the serpent, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle." v. 14. "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow." v. 16. And unto Adam, "cursed is the ground for thy

1. How were our first parents created?

sake, . . . thorns, also, and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee." v. 17, 18.

This, in scripture language, is a history of the fall of our first parents from the perfect holiness in which they were created. By which all their posterity, in virtue of their constituted relation to him —[1]Adam being their head and representative— come into the world with sinful natures, "going astray as soon as they be born." [2]They sin not by constraint or force, but deliberately and voluntarily, as soon as they are capable of moral action. [3]Sin, with all its numerous train of evils, entered the world as a consequence of the fall. [4]We do not suffer for, neither are we personally guilty of, Adam's sin. As [5]I am not personally guilty for the act of my agent, though I must suffer in consequence of it, if it be imprudent. That we are not punished *for* the sin of Adam, is taught in [6]Ezekiel, 18: 2, 3, "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion to use this proverb any more in Israel. The

1. What constituted relation did Adam bear to his posterity? Who constituted this relation? Was it reasonable that God should constitute it?—As God had more wisdom and benevolence than Adam or his posterity, was he not more capable of choosing a representative for them, than they would be for themselves? If they had been called upon to choose a representative could they have chosen a better one than Adam? 2. Does their connection with Adam make it necessary for his posterity to sin? 3. What was the first introduction of sin and misery into the world? 4. Do we suffer for, or in consequence of, Adam's sin, or are we guilty of it? 5. How can that be illustrated? 6. How can you prove that we are not punished for the sin of Adam?

soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." "The father shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the father; every man shall be put to death for his own sin." Let no man, therefore, attempt to exculpate himself on account of Adam's sin: nor find fault with the consequences of it; [1]for, by the first sin he commits, which is his first moral act, and by every successive sin, he endorses the very sin of Adam, and says, "had I been in his place, I would have acted as he did."

[2]It is sometimes asked, as God had all power in his hands, why he did not preserve Adam from falling, and thus prevent the fearful consequences which have followed? To this it has very improperly been replied, [3]as "God made man free, he could not prevent his falling without destroying his freedom; and he chose to make man free, though he knew he would fall, rather than have him stand bereft of freedom." We firmly believe in the perfect freedom of man, and also [4]that God could have prevented the fall without destroying it. God has never relinquished his government over any portion

1. Why need not the posterity of Adam find fault with him? 2. What question is sometimes asked? 3. How has this been answered? Is that answer correct? 4. What is the truth?

of his works. To suppose it were derogatory to the character of God. [1]He governs all minds. [2]"The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water, he turneth it whithersoever he will." Prov. 21: 1. And he does this without destroying their freedom. [3]Thus he turned the heart of king Cyrus, so that, though a heathen, he issued a decree for rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem. Cyrus acted freely in this matter, though God had declared in prophecy, more than a hundred and fifty years before, that he should do it. [3]He controlled the hearts of the murderers of our Lord, so that they accomplished his purpose in putting to death the Lord of glory, without, in the least, affecting their guilt. [4]"Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel [purpose] and foreknowledge of God, [5]ye (of your own free will) have taken, crucified and slain." Acts, 2: 23. [6]Without in the least affecting the freedom of men, he so controls the hearts of all who are ever finally saved; that, though once entirely averse to him, they now yield a free, cheerful, and willing obedience. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." Ps. 110: 3.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that had God seen best, he *could* have controlled the heart of Adam so as to have preserved him from falling

---

1. What does God govern? 2. Proof? 3. What illustrations? 4. Had God determined that Christ should suffer? 5. Did he regard his murderers any the less guilty because of his decree? Were they not just as free though God had not decreed it? 6. Does not God control the hearts of men even whilst they act freely in conversion?

*without having destroyed his free agency.* As he did not do it, [1]we must conclude that it was because God determined to overrule his fall for the best good of the universe,—[1]and that the sum of happiness will be increased—[1]that a greater and more illustrious display of God's character will be made, than could have been made had sin never entered the world.

By the fall, we have said, that Adam became a sinful being; [2]his posterity partake of the same sinful character. Adam, immediately after his sad defection, "begat a son in his own likeness, after his image"—[3]fallen, like himself. [4]"Who," says Job, "can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." Job, 14: 4. The stream cannot be purer than the fountain. "How can he be clean (free from sin) that is born of a woman," [corrupt and depraved.] Job, 25: 4. The branches must derive their character from the root. To show how early a sinful character is attached to the descendants of Adam, says the Psalmist, [5]"Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." And says the Savior, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," that which is born from corrupt and sinful nature will be corrupt and sinful,

1. As God could control the heart of Adam without affecting his freedom, and did not do it, what must we conclude? 2. What is the character of Adam's posterity since the fall? 3. What was the character of Adam's first son? 4. If parents be unholy, what must be the character of their children? 5 How early does a sinful character attach itself to the descendants of Adam.

and hence he says, "ye must be born again" in order to be fit for heaven.

Should an infant, possessing as it does a sinful nature, be transferred to heaven, unrenewed, [1]it would manifest its love of sin, and grow up a sinner, even as the young lion would grow up carniverous, though reared with the lamb. Native depravity is proved,

1. [2]From the fact that sinfulness characterizes the race. [3]"The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy, there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Ps. 14: 2, 3. [3]"Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. 51: 5. [See the above cited passages.] All the infants of the race, Jesus Christ excepted, as they have advanced in age, have evinced a sinful disposition. [3]"The carnal mind is emnity against God." Rom. 8: 7.

2. [4]Circumcision, under the law, was performed to intimate the necessity of the "new birth"—the "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Col. 2: 11. [5]So baptism, under the gospel by Christ's appointment, represents the cleansing of the soul from sin by the blood

1. Could you suppose an infant to be taken to heaven with its heart unchanged, what would be its character? 2. What is the first argument to prove native depravity? 3. What texts prove this? 4. What is the second argument to prove that man is sinful by nature? 5. What were these ordinances used to denote?

of Christ, applied by the Holy Ghost in his purifying influences. [5]These ordinances were used to show that infants were sinful in their nature, and in need of a change to fit them for heaven.

3. [1]They must be born again to be fitted for heaven. "Marvel not that I said unto you, ye must be born again." John, 3: 7. If they ever enter heaven, it must be [2]in virtue of the atonement made by Jesus Christ. [3]"Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts, 4: 12. All who ever enter heaven will join in singing this song: [4]"Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing," "for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by the blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; And hast made us unto our God, kings and priests." Rev. 5: 12, 9. If infants are not sinful, and condemned in consequence of the fall, [5]they can never join in this song. But we believe [6]that they will join in this song, and, though they are sinful, that they will be saved through the blood of Christ—that those dying in infancy are born again, and were elect according to the foreknowledge of God.

---

1. What is the third argument? 2. In virtue of what must infants enter heaven? 3. What proof? 4. What song will all who enter heaven join in singing? 5. What absurdity is involved in supposing that infants are not sinful? 6. What do orthodox churches believe?

4. [1]Infants evince their depravity by early exhibiting sinful passions; [2]by impatience, anger, jealousy, pride, self-will, and obstinacy; they early act like sinful beings. "They go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." Ps. 5: 8.

5. The common sufferings to which infants are subject, shows that under God's government [3]they are actually suffering the penalty of condemnation, attached to Adam's transgression. They open their eyes upon a world of trouble; they no sooner breathe, than they become heirs to sorrow and to pain, as a consequence of the fall.

6. [4]The scriptures abundantly show the native depravity of man. That [5]he is not born without moral character, or "like a sheet of white paper." [6]He is positively sinful. "The seeds of sin grow up for death." [7]"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. 4: 12. [See whole chapter.] [7]"Thou wast called a transgressor from the womb." Isai. 48: 8. [7]"The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." Gen. 8: 21.

[8]All animate and inanimate nature suffered in consequence of the fall. [9]"Because thou hast

1. What is the fourth argument used to prove that infants are sinful? 2. What traits of character do they exhibit? 3. What do we infer from the sufferings to which infants are exposed? 4. What do the scriptures teach? 5. Has he a moral character when born? 6. What do you say to his being like a sheet of white paper? 7. What proof? 8. What else besides man suffered in the fall? 9. What proof?

hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake." Gen. 3: 17. [9] "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain until now." Rom. 8: 22.

[1] Man is not only sinful by nature, but he is *totally sinful*. He is not only utterly destitute of holiness, so that [2] he never thinks a holy thought, or speaks a holy word, or performs a holy action, but [3] all his thoughts, words and actions are unholy—unlike God—until he is renewed by divine grace. Yet [4] we do not believe that man is as bad as he *can* be. [5] He is restrained by *natural conscience*, [5] by the *Spirit* and *word* of God, where it is enjoyed, and [5] by *influences* resulting from it, where it is not enjoyed—[5] by the *light of nature*—[5] by *self-interest* leading to the formation of human laws—[5] by being made *mortal*, subject to pain and death, not living long enough to get as bad as he would become—[5] and by various *circumstances* calculated to subdue his natural tendency to evil. Nor 2, Are all equally wicked. [6] Some are much worse than others. There is a great variety of character, though all are sinful. Nor 3, Are men destitute of *interesting* and *amiable qualities*.

---

1. We have shown that man is depraved by nature, what is the degree of this depravity? 2. Is any thing that proceeds from him holy? 3. What is the character of his thoughts, words, and actions, until renewed? 4. What do we believe concerning the sinfulness of man? 5. By what is he restrained, that keeps him from being as bad as he would otherwise become? 6. Are all men, though totally depraved, equally wicked?

[1]Some men are naturally tender-hearted, humane, obliging, kind to the poor, generous and patriotic, and appear to human view lovely. Nor 4, Are the *natural capacities,* or *abilities* of men destroyed. [2]They have just as much capacity for loving as hating, for doing good as evil. But 1, [3]They are *entirely destitute of holiness.* Their God-like powers are not consecrated to the best good of the world. 2. [4]*They never act with reference to pleasing God.* "God," in the sense of glorifying or honoring him, is not in all their thoughts." Hence, they disobey God, even in doing that which is right, [5]in not doing it, *as* God commanded them, to glorify him. It is in this sense that the plowing of the wicked is sin, [6]because they do not plow from right motives, to please God. [7]But, though sinful for them to plow, it is more sinful for them to be idle, and not plow. 3. [8]Natural men are *supremely selfish.* Self is their *governing* motive. And supreme selfishness is the exact opposite of God and holiness. [9]God acts for the best good of all concerned; they act for what they consider their best interests. 4. Natural men *act out* their selfish and sinful dispositions [10]just as far as God will permit them.

1. By saying that men are totally depraved, do we deny that they possess some naturally amiable qualities? 2. By being totally depraved, are they naturally unable to do good? Or love God? 3. What, in the first place, do we mean by it? 4. What in the second place? 5. Wherein do impenitent men disobey God, even when their actions are right in themselves? 6. Why is the plowing of the wicked, sin? 7. Should they therefore refrain from labor? 8. What, in the third place, do we mean by men's being totally depraved? 9. Wherein differs the actions of God, and the actions of impenitent men? 10. How far do wicked men manifest their evil dispositions?

[1] "Behold, thou hast spoken and done evil things as thou couldest." Jer. 3: 5. The less the restraints above mentioned are felt, the more wicked men are. Look at a heathen and then at a christian land, the contrast is striking, but it is all owing to the different restraints that God has thrown around men. Were the most refined moralist in this land to be transferred there, [2] a wonderful change would take place in his practice. And had he been born there, [3] he had been as the heathen are. [4] God's restraints, not innate virtue, makes all the difference discernable among natural men. Let no man flatter himself [5] that because he has a good disposition, therefore he has that, which, with a little improvement, will make him an object of the divine favor. Such a sentiment, embraced, is awfully dangerous, and [6] precludes the hope of heaven. "They that be whole need not [do not desire] a physician, but they that are sick." Math. 9: 12. The natural heart of the best of men is an object awfully offensive to God. [7] It is entirely defiled. [8] "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint, from the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds and bruises, and putrifying sores; they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither molified with ointment." Isai. 1: 5, 6. [8] "As it is

1. Proof? 2. Suppose a moralist were to remove from this and reside in a heathen land? 3. What had been his character had he been born there? 4. What does this prove? 5. What idea is exceedingly dangerous for any man to believe? 6. Why so dangerous? 7. Is there not some spark of good remaining in the natural heart since the fall? 8. Proof?

written, There is none righteous, no, not one. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God: They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable, there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Rom. 3: 10–12. [8]"Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart." Eph. 4: 18. [8]"The carnal mind is enmity against God." Rom. 8: 7. And, says the Savior, "ye have hated me without a cause."

Such, now, is man as a race; naturally and totally depraved; no spark of holiness lingers about him, which may be matured so as to prepare him for heaven. This state, by nature, is also [1]a state of *condemnation*. He comes into the world condemned, and remains condemned [2]until he is pardoned. [3]"He that believeth not is condemned already." John, 3: 18. Hence [4]they are called, "Children of wrath," because while unpardoned they are subject to wrath. [5]They are under sentence as a criminal who has had his trial and been condemned. But, [6]"Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil"—Eccl. 8: 11, they become hardened in sin.

---

1. Having broken God's law, in what state besides being sinful, is man since the fall? 2. How long does he remain condemned? 3. Proof? 4. What are impenitent men called in consequence of their being under condemnation, and why? 5. What is their condition? 6. What effect has God's forbearance upon them?

## ARTICLE IV.

[1]The Atonement. — Its Sufficiency. — Its Application. — Its Necessity.

When man had fallen, and was justly condemned to eternal death, [3]God, out of mere mercy, when man had no claims upon him, [2]devised the plan of redemption, [4]believing penitent sinners of the human race, were to be saved by the obedience, sufferings and death of his only begotten Son.

The atonement made by Jesus Christ, which literally means [5]a covering, or reconciliation, [6]leaves, in itself, the character of the sinner, and God's feelings towards him, unaltered, but [7]makes it possible for a reconciliation to be effected by the Holy Ghost.

[8]Christ endures such an amount of suffering as satisfies divine justice, and makes it consistent and honorable for God, as a moral governor, to make overtures of pardon on the terms of the gospel, and to *reconcile* sinners to "himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." 2 Cor. 5: 19. [9]Believing and reconciled sinners, though just as guilty as ever, are treated, on account of the atonement, as innocent, or righteous.

---

1. What is the subject of the 4th article? 2. What did God do when man had sinned and ruined himself? 3. Why did God do it? 4. What was this plan? 5. What is the meaning of atonement? 6. What influence has the atonement on man? On God? 7. What does it do? 8. How? 9. Does the atonement, or the change effected in the sinner when he is reconciled, take away his guilt? If not, what effect has it on them?

[1] We do not suppose that Christ endured the same kind, or amount of suffering, that sinners had endured had he not died for their redemption. But [2] in view of the dignity of the sufferer, he being truly God as well as truly man, [3] his human nature only suffering, whilst [4] his divine nature sustained it and gave value to the sacrifice, infinite wisdom considered his sufferings as amply sufficient to answer [5] all the ends in God's government, that *would* have been answered by the eternal sufferings of the whole human family. [6] He suffered just *what* was necessary, no less and no more, to make an atoning sacrifice. Hence, it is not true that "one drop of the blood of Christ had been sufficient for the world's redemption. His work had been incomplete had he endured one less pain or one moment's less suffering; besides God's benevolence never would have permitted him to endure one unnecessary pang. [7] Nothing short of a divine Redeemer could have made an atonement that was infinite. And nothing but an infinite atonement could give satisfaction for an infinite crime. "It is not possible," says the Holy Spirit, "that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin." Heb. 10: 4. [8] Because it

---

1. Did Christ suffer as much as all the sinners of the race had suffered had he not died? 2. Why then were his sufferings satisfactory to divine justice? 3 Did his divine nature suffer? 4. Of what use was his divine nature? 5. What ends were accomplished by the obedience, sufferings, and death of this divine Redeemer? 6. Did he suffer any more or less than was necessary? 7. Why must the sufferer be divine? 8. Why could not the blood of bulls and goats, or at most the blood of man, make an atonement?

would not sufficiently show enormity of sin, nor convince the universe of God's hatred of it, nor his determination to maintain his government at all hazards. On the same grounds it is not possible that the blood of any finite being, man, nor angel, could take away sin. [1]To deny the divinity of the atoning sacrifice, is to render all the provisions of the atonement null and void, utterly inadequate to make a proper atonement for sin.

[2]In its EXTENT, the atonement is sufficient for the sins of the world. [3]If any perish it is not because ample provisions have not been made for their salvation. [3]All are commanded, invited and entreated to come and avail themselves of them. [4]"God now commandeth all men every where to repent." Acts, 17: 30. [4]"Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth." Isai. 45: 22. [4]"Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." Isai. 55: 1. [4]"The Spirit and the bride say come, and let him that heareth say come, and whosoever will, let him take of the waters of life freely." Rev. 22: 17. For [4]"He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John, 2: 2. [4]"Jesus tasted death for

1. What is the effect of denying the divinity of the atoning sacrifice?—2. What is the extent of the atonement? 3. Are provisions made for all? 4. Proof?

every man." Heb. 2: 9. All men are benefitted by the atonement. [1] Common temporal mercies are bestowed upon all men in consequence of it. Men who are never saved from eternal ruin, are greatly benefitted in this life by it, in [2] the *restraints* which it throws around them and others. The world, with all its natural beauties and adaptations to the wants of men, would have been an unfit abode for the human family, if no influence in restraining their vices had been exerted in consequence of the atonement —[2] the Bible, with all its alarming and interesting communications, which has so greatly modified human conduct—[2] natural conscience and the Holy Spirit, which strives with all men—[2] those natural qualities which render men, in general, fit for society, and some peculiarly lovely, are all bestowed upon man in consequence of the atonement made by Jesus Christ. [3] But whilst these general provisions were made by the atonement, so that God could be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus, so as to open the way for the salvation of the whole human family. Christ gave not his life upon uncertainties. [3] The salvation of some was secured in that covenant transaction, called [4] the *covenant* of *redemption*, by which he was to die for the sins

---

1. Of what use is the atonement to those who are not finally saved? 2. What are some of the blessings received by the world at large in consequence of the atonement? 3. Whilst the way was opened for the salvation of all men, by the atonement, what was received by it? 4. What is the name of that covenant by which the salvation of some was made certain?

of a world. [1]"I have made a covenant with my chosen." Ps. 89: 3. [1]"The bread that I will give," saith the Savior, "is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." John, 6: 51. By this covenant it was made certain [2]that those given to Christ, should be brought, by the sovereign influences of the Holy Spirit, to submit their hearts to him, and become his willing and obedient followers, and finally, after having their graces sufficiently tried, should dwell with him forever in heaven, as the trophies of his conquest over satan. [3]And though others, to whom the offers of pardon were freely and sincerely made, *might* utterly reject to their soul's undoing; these should *surely come*, accept and live forever. A knowledge of this covenant made the Savior say, [4]"All that the Father giveth me *shall* come to me." John, 6: 37. [4]"It is my Father's will that of *all* which he hath *given* me I should lose nothing." John, 6: 39. "I pray not for the world, but for *them* which thou hast *given* me." John, 17: 9. "Keep through thine own name *those* whom thou hast *given* me to be where I am." "Thine they were, but thou hast *given* them to me." "For *their* sake I sanctify myself,"—set myself apart as a sacrifice for sin. And says God, the Father, addressing the Son, "Thy

1. What proof of this covenant? 2. What was made certain by this covenant? By what name are those given to Christ generally called? Ans. The Elect. 3. Is it certain that all those given to Christ will be brought in and saved? 4. Proof?

people shall be willing in the day of thy power." Ps. 110.

In all these passages, and many others that might be quoted, [1]the covenant of redemption, by which all who are ever finally saved, were given to Christ, is most clearly referred to. [2]We cannot suppose that Christ died upon uncertainties. It is expressly promised by the Father [3]"That when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he *shall see* his seed, . . . the pleasure of the Lord *shall prosper* in his hand. He *shall see* of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." Isai. 53: 10, 11. And we see in his last prayer with his disciples what, this travail of his soul was: "Father, *I will* [4]*that they* also, whom thou hast given me, *be with me where I am*." [5]"I pray for *them;* I pray *not* for the world; but for *them* which thou hast *given* me." John, 17: 24, 9. That this does not refer to his disciples exclusively, is clear from the 20th verse, [6]"neither pray I for them *alone*, but for them, also, that *shall* believe on me through their word."

Thus Christ died, in a sense, for all men, "is the propitiation for the sins of the world—tasted death for *every* man." [7]He opened the way for the salvation of all men. Made it consistent and honora-

---

1. What is referred to in the passages above cited? 2. Did Christ know who would be savingly benefitted by his death? 3. What is promised? 4. What was the travail of his soul? 5. For whom in a special manner does he at this time pray? 6. May not this refer entirely to his disciples? 7. In what sense did Christ die for all men?

ble in God to save all who would *accept* the terms of salvation. Yet, [1] by previous contract, he *secured* the salvation of those who were given to him from before the foundation of the world. They *certainly* will be saved, none will be lost. And yet, [2] "Him that cometh unto me I will in *no wise cast out*," but as [3] none, left to themselves, will come, and as Christ knew it before he laid down his life, [4] he secured by covenant engagement so many as infinite wisdom and benevolence could consistently bestow, and of these he says, "*All* that the Father *giveth* me *shall* come." [5] *They* will not come, if left to themselves, more than others. [6] They will not be *forced* to come, yet they, just as sure as God sits on his throne, and has power to bring them, *shall come*, as we shall now fully explain in the next article.

## NECESSITY OF THE ATONEMENT.

The atonement was not necessary to render God benevolent. He ever has been, and ever will be, *infinitely* benevolent to all his creatures. Nor 2d, to change the feelings of God towards sin or the sinner. This cannot be. His hatred towards sin and the sinner, is eternal and immutable.

But, 1. [7] It was necessary, because man had bro-

1. What did he secure by it? 2. Is any obstacle thrown in the way of the salvation of any of the human family, because the salvation of the elect is made certain? 3. Why are any lost? 4. Why are any saved? 5 Are the elect any more willing to come than others? 6. Will they be forced to come? 7. What is the first reason assigned for the necessity of the atonement?

ken the *law* of his sovereign, and incurred its righteous penalty—[1]*eternal death*. This penalty was necessary [2]to the very existence of the law. Without penalty law were mere advice.

2. [3]It was necessary fully to show God's determination, *at all hazards*, to maintain his government.

3. [4]It was necessary to honor the law, to show God's respect for it—his abhorrence of sin, and his love of holiness.

4. [5]Hence satisfaction—atonement must be made for transgression. The law being a transcript of God's character, immutable like himself, could not change. The decree had gone forth, "the soul that sinneth it shall die." [6]Pardon, without an atonement, had encouraged transgression, as do pardons under human governments.

5. [7]The utter ruin of the race alone, had been satisfaction. [8]*They* must have suffered the penalty, or its equivalent be suffered by a substitute, whose sufferings, though less in amount, and whose death, would exert as salutary an influence on God's government, as would have been exerted by the ruin of the race.

6. [9]The death of Christ evinces the necessity of

---

1. What was the penalty of transgression? 2. Why a penalty necessary? 3. What the second argument for the necessity of the atonement? 4. The third? 5. The fourth? 6. What effect, had man been pardoned without an atonement? 7. What the fifth reason for the necessity of an atonement? 8. What was the alternative? 9. What in the sixth place, proves the necessity of an atonement?

an atonement for sin. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son. That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John, 1: 16. [1]God never would have given up his Son to die, unless necessary. Nor would Christ have consented to be made an offering unless necessary. [2]"O, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." Math. 26: 39. "Thus it behoved Christ to suffer."

Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God, by perfectly obeying the law during his whole life, in his human nature, and by suffering in his own body upon the cross, the penalty of the broken law, in the place of the sinner, has [3]made a complete atonement for sin. [4]God now can be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

---

## ARTICLE V.

Salvation Offered. — Voluntarily Rejected. — The Influence of the Holy Spirit in renewing the Heart.

1. Since such a full atonement has been made, *salvation is freely offered* [5] *to all the fallen sons of Adam.* As the way has been opened by the atonement for a world's salvation—the world is freely and sincerely invited to come and obtain it. The fall

1. What do we infer from the fact that God gave his son to die, and that the son consented to be made a sacrifice? 2. What proof of this inference? 3. What has Jesus Christ done by his obedience, sufferings, and death? 4. What is now possible? 5. Through the atonement, to whom is salvation freely offered?

converted the world into a vast prison house for condemned criminals. [1]The atonement has thrown open the doors of this prison, and invites [2]all without exception, one as freely as another, to come out and be forever happy. The servant of God is commanded to go out and proclaim, [3]"*Come*, for all things are ready." "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters," "he that hath no money," —ye poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked, and starving,—*come*, yea, come buy wine and milk without money and without price." [4]Salvation is freely offered, and is *free*, so free that it cannot be bought, by groans or tears, by obedience, or faith, or repentance. [5]Nothing you can do will buy salvation; it is *free*, and like the gift of the Holy Ghost, cannot be sold. [6]Come, accept of it as a free gift, is the invitation.

2. [7]All men, without a single exception, reject these offers of mercy. [8]This is clearly taught by our Lord in the parable of the great supper, Luke, 14: 16–24, which is designed [9]to show the fullness of gospel provisions, and the reception that the gospel meets with whereever it is presented. [10]"Come," said the servant, "for all things are now ready." "And [11]they all, with one consent, began to make

---

1. As the fall converted the world into a vast prison house for condemned criminals, what has been accomplished by the atonement? 2. Who are invited to come out? 3. What is the invitation which the servant of God is commanded to give? 4. Is salvation free? 5. May it not be bought? 6. What is the invitation? 7. How do men treat this kind invitation? 8. Can this be possible? 9. What is the design of the parable of the great supper? 10. What was the invitation in the parable? 11. Did they not at once accept it?

excuse," v. 17 and 18. [1]Every individual of the race has treated the invitations of the gospel in the same manner—all have rejected them.

3. [2]This rejection is voluntary. [2]Men have no excuse for it. Some say they cannot embrace Christ, because it is decreed that they shall not. but [3]*God's decrees do not effect their freedom or their guilt*—they have never excluded a soul from heaven. [4]Men have just as much *capacity* to obey the requirements of God, as to disobey—to love as to hate—and so far as God's decrees are concerned, can do one as easily as the other. And more, [5]there is nothing *unreasonable* in these requirements. God considers all of his intelligences as members of one great family, and [6]he simply requires that each member of his family do what he *can* for its highest enjoyment.

As evidence that men voluntarily refuse obedience, and reject the offers of the gospel, let me say, 1. [7]They do *not* do what they know they *can* and *ought* to do. They do not *pray*, nor *read the Bible* to learn their duty; nor *hear* the gospel preached, with a design to practice what they hear, nor strive to fix what they hear in their minds, but rather to dissipate all serious impressions; they do not keep

---

1. But condemned sinners do not treat the invitations to life in this way? 2. Are they not in some way forced to this inconsistent and ruinous course? 3. If it is decreed that they will not be saved, can they help it? 4. Is it possible for man to obey God, when it is decreed that he shall not? 5. Are not God's requirements so strict that he cannot obey them if he should try? 6. What only does God require? 7. What evidence that men do not desire to obey God, and that they are voluntary in rejecting the offer of mercy?

the sabbath as they know they can and ought; nor do they do any thing to keep in remembrance the sufferings and death of Christ. 2. They *do* many things which they know they *ought not*, and from which they know they *can* and *ought* to refrain. Some use profane language, thus declaring by their oaths that they are enemies of God, and trample under foot the holy sabbath, by talking about things of a worldly nature, or even performing secular labor. Some live upon unlawful gains, or follow unlawful and unholy business. Some live in rioting and debauchery. They know these things are wrong, and that they can and ought to refrain from them, yet they do not. This shows [1] that men are voluntary in disobedience and rejection of the offers of salvation. They reject simply because they choose to do it. All the damned in hell have voluntarily rejected life when it was freely offered to them.

4. [2] That any ever accept of offered pardon, and are brought to submit to Christ, even after such abundant provisions have been made, is owing entirely to the sovereign and efficacious influences of the Holy Spirit in renewing their hearts. The hearts of men are all alike by nature. All are

---

1. What does the neglect of so many duties, which they know they can and ought to perform, and the commission of so many sins, from which they know they can, and ought to refrain, prove? 2. If when the invitations of the gospel are made, all treat them exactly alike—reject them, how is it that any are brought to accept them?

"dead in trespasses and sins." [1]The strongest conceivable motive will produce no effect on men morally dead—who really hate God. The strongest motives will not induce a man to love pain, though they may induce him to suffer it. Men's opposition to God is as real and as strong as their opposition to pain. And though [2]powerful motives, as the dread of endless burning, or the promise of everlasting happiness, may induce them to render external homage, they can never induce him to love the service of a being so much hated. Though with every capacity to love God, and to come to Christ, the Savior says, [3]"Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Thus the whole blame of their destruction is thrown where it properly belongs—[4]upon themselves—upon their own indisposition to come.

In this state of utter and entire hostility to God; when all, like lost sheep, are going astray; when no motives will prevail on any to stop; when all the provisions of the atonement would be lost—so far as saving men from eternal death are concerned; when there would be no hope for a single soul, if left to themselves, [5]God, by his sovereign power and mercy, interposes, and in his own way, effects the final salvation of those given to Christ in the

1. Will motives induce men to love God? 2. What influence may motives have? 3. What reason does the Savior give why men do not come to him and live forever? 4. On whom then, rests the guilt of their destruction? 5. But when all, after such abundant provisions have been made, would reject and die, if left to themselves, by what means are any rescued?

covenant of redemption, whilst the others are left to their own chosen way.

[1]The first exercise of the mind, ordinarily, is *consideration*, which is produced by the Spirit's influence in fixing the attention of the careless sinner upon his own situation. "I thought on my ways," said the Psalmist, "and turned my feet unto thy testimonies. Ps. 119: 59. The prodigal "came to himself." Consideration usually produces [2]*conviction of sin*, which, in few words, is [3]a heart-felt sense of one's personal ill desert as a transgressor of God's holy and righteous law—a feeling sense of the enormity of sin as committed against God. "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned." Ps. 51: 4. And of personal vileness in the sight of holy being: of unworthiness and of self-renuciation.

Conviction of sin is produced in the mind [4]by the Holy Ghost. [5]"When he is come, he will reprove [convince] the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of a judgment," John, 16: 8,—by a presentation of the law of God, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." "I have not known sin but by the law." Rom. 7: 7. "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ." Gal. 3: 24. [6]The experience of almost every person under conviction, has been different. [7]Some never had the most aw-

---

1. What is the first exercise of the mind produced by the Holy Spirit? 2. What is the result of serious consideration? 3. What is genuine conviction for sin? 4. By what agency is conviction for sin produced? 5. Proof? 6. Is the exercise of all persons under conviction, alike? 7. What has been the experience of some?

ful and distressing sense of sin and condemnation, whilst [1]others have appeared to have little else than a full conviction of the truth that they were sinners, and really deserving of death. Their great distress was [2]that they had so little of a sense of their own sinfulness. This depends somewhat on [3]previous knowledge, on individual temperament, or the means by which their attention was arrested; but more upon the pungency and power with which the Holy Spirit applies the truth to the heart.

[4]Conviction, however intense, makes a man no better, it only reveals his character to himself—does not alter it. [5]He grows worse, more hateful, in God's sight faster, when under conviction, than ever before in his life.

[6]That we have had deep conviction, and long continued, is no evidence in favor of our being christians, or that our convictions have been slight, and of short continuance, no evidence against us. [7]The only object of conviction is to drive the sinner to Christ. It is like the chastisement of a kind parent, inflicted upon a disobedient child. He would rather he would obey without correction, but if he will not, he must be corrected. So [8]God would be better pleased with the sinner, if he would obey with-

---

1. Of others? 2. On what account have some been distressed? 3. What makes the difference in their experience? 4. Does conviction make a man's character any better? 5. What his condition when under the deepest conviction? 6. If we have had deep convictions, have we any more reason to think that we are christians, or the contrary? 7. What is the object of conviction? 8. Is God the better pleased with us because we are under deep conviction?

out forcing him to rend his soul with conviction. [1]The tears of convicted sinners, so far from being evidence of penitence, are usually evidence of their obstinacy—of their unwillingness to submit and give up all. [2]When an obstinate child stands out against his parent, he weeps, when he yields his tears are dried and smiles appear. Nor can it truly be said of an impenitent sinner, that he "desires religion," that he "wants to be a christian," that he is a "seeker after religion," or that he has "sought the Lord sorrowing many days." [3]All these expressions applied to unregenerate men, are calculated to mislead their minds as to their real character, and render the prospect of their conversion more doubtful. [4]That they desire happiness there can be no doubt, but that unregenerate men who hate God and holiness, desire that which they hate, no one, when they consider it, will pretend. The heart of a convicted sinner is just what it always was; [5]the only difference in him is, once he was not convinced of his sins, now he is convinced of them. And all that he does partakes of the character of his heart, and is, therefore, selfish and sinful. He breaks off from sin [6]because he is afraid to sin, [7]he performs religious duties in hopes of being pardoned, but

1. Are the tears of impenitent sinners evidence in their favor? 2. What illustration showing that tears do not evince repentence? 3. What is the danger of calling convicted sinners "seekers after religion," or of saying of them, "they want religion," and that "they have sought the Lord, sorrowing many days?" 4. Do unregenerate men desire religion? 5. Is there any difference in the character of a convicted or unconvicted sinner? 6. Why does the convicted sinner break off from sin? 7. Why does he perform religious duties?

[1]gaining no evidence, he often says, "I do not see that it does any good, and I may just as well give up." This feeling shows [2]the character of his heart: that he is working for wages—heaven—and if he sees that he cannot obtain it, he will cease all efforts. When they have begun in this way, many obtain [3]hopes because they have performed some religious duties. [4]Their hopes of forgiveness produce joyful sensations. And in proportion to the strength of their hopes, however delusive, is their joy. And feeling such a change from deep conviction to sudden joy, they say, [5]"I know I have experienced religion." When alas! [6]"a deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?" Isai. 44: 20. [7]In a short time his fears subside, his duties are neglected, and his hopes depart, and he returns, like the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire. Her nature was never changed, else she had never more desired to return to the place of pollution.

Too many in this way, it is to be feared, mistake conviction for conversion. [8]Those who are finally converted, also attend to duty, but they are not satisfied with their efforts; fears of trusting to work

1. What is ordinarily the result of this selfish performance of duty? 2. What does his relinquishing all efforts at a religious life, show? 3. What do these selfish efforts sometimes produce? 4 What effect is produced by their hopes? 5. What do they often confidently say? 6. Do they know? 7. What is the evidence of his being deceived? 8. How are those exercised who are finally converted?

arise; they are afraid of their own hearts, and seeing no way to escape, beg of God for deliverance. Though convinced that [1]there is no virtue in the prayer that proceeds from an unregenerate heart, [2]they feel that there is no alternative. It is their duty to pray, and they *must* pray; and the more they pray the more sinful and unworthy their prayers appear, until at last they seem to themselves to be sinking down to hell justly. Up to this period their hearts are made no better, but are all the time growing worse. Yet [3]the Holy Spirit, by the law of God and its dreadful penalty, has driven them where divine compassion comes to their relief.

[4]*Regeneration* is the specific act of the Holy Spirit upon the heart in making it a new creature in Christ Jesus, when [5]it was in a state the most unfit for heaven that it ever was, yet when it saw its state. [6]A relish for spiritual and divine things is imparted to the soul. [6]The evil disposition which leads the natural man only astray, is so transformed by the power of God, mysteriously exerted, in perfect accordance with his freedom, that it now leads to habitual acts of obedience and piety. [7]The precise mode of this change I pretend not to define. It is one of God's mysteries. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou heareth the sound thereof, but

1. Is there any thing virtuous in the prayers of impenitent men? 2. Is it their duty to pray, and do they do it? 3. Of what use have these exercises and duties been to the convicted sinner? 4. What is regeneration? 5. What was the state of the heart the moment previous to the act of regeneration? 6. What is the nature of this change? 7. How does the Holy Spirit renew the heart?

canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." John, 3: 8. [1]It is, however, a radical change, an instantaneous work, performed by the Spirit of God. [2]The scriptures represent the heart of man as that which is evil, and as the seat of every thing sinful, [3]"From the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries," &c. Math. 15: 19. [4]By which it seems to be intended that there is something back of moral exercises which gives rise to them—back of thought that thinks. This in scripture, often at least, is called the heart, which, like a poisoned fountain, sends forth streams of death. An unrenewed heart is called an "uncircumcised heart," "a heart of stone." Here the change is effected in regeneration by the power of the Spirit. [5]"I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh, that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances to do them." Ezek. 11: 19, 20. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." Ezek. 36: 26. When this is done [6]the man becomes a new creature, and "if any man be in Christ Jesus he is a new creature." 2 Cor. 5: 17. He is born again, and Jesus said, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the

1. Is it a partial and gradual change, or entire and instantaneous? 2. What is the seat of wickedness in man? 3. Proof. 4. What is meant by the heart? 5. What does God do in regeneration? 6. What is the character of the man when he has a new heart?

kingdom of God. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again." John, 3: 3. [1]A change as radical and as important must take place in every natural man, as took place at his birth. He who is "dead in trespasses and sins," must be animated with life. And "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." [2]Human means, though necessary to be used, and without which none will be converted, are utterly unavailing. [3]It is God's work, and God's alone, not part the work of the creature and part the work of God. "He will not give his glory to another." [4]"God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we *were dead in sins*, hath *quickened* us, [made the first motion of spiritual life,] together with Christ. By grace are ye saved, . . . . . not by works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works." Eph. 2: 4–10. [4]"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. 3: 5.

[5]Until this change is effected, he is the slave of sin, led captive by satan at his will. Not that satan can force him into sin, but he yields himself up to the control of the prince of the power of the air,

---

1. How great a change must be effected in every natural man? 2. Is this accomplished by human agency? 3. Is it not part the work of man and part the work of God, or does not the creature go so far, then God comes to meet him? 4. Proof. 5. What is the condition of the sinner previous to this change?

the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Eph. 2: 2. "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are, to whom ye obey." Rom. 6: 16. [1]After he is regenerated the power of satan is so far destroyed, that he no more has dominion over him. Before it sin reigned as sovereign." Rom. 5: 12. After it being made freed from the dominions, or ruling power of sin, "ye became the servants of righteousness." v. 18. [2]A holy principle is now implanted, a principle of love and obedience, which just as surely and as steadily points to God, as its chief object of attraction, as the needle points to the pole. The needle on board a tempest-tost vessel may veer and vary, first one way and then the other, but it finds no rest until it is fixed upon the pole. So this holy principle in the regenerate. It may veer and vary, owing to the temptations and trials of this life, but [3]he finds no rest, only as his heart is fixed on God, and he is conscious that it is his great business to please him. "O, God," said the Psalmist, "my heart is fixed; I am purposed that I will not transgress."

This holy principle, which is the germ of all holy affections, may be very small at first, like the leaven which the woman "hid in three measures of meal, until the whole was leavened." Math. 13: 33.

1. What after? 2. By what is he characterised? 3. Where only does the renewed soul find rest?

[1]Man, when born, is a babe physically; when born *again*, he is a babe morally, but all the parts of the future man are there—all the graces of the Spirit exist in miniature. And being thus renewed, [2]he is commanded to "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. 3: 18. And [3]they will grow, and cannot be christians without it. God has appointed [4]various means "For the perfecting of the saints, . . . . till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Eph. 4: 12, 13. This spiritual advancement, after regeneration, is called, [5]*sanctification*, or *progressive holiness*, or growth in grace, and is carried on by the Spirit of God [6]by means of the truth, variously communicated. [7]"Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." John, 17: 7. [8]Every christian is sanctified, set apart to the service of God, i. e., in part. In the natural state, the old man spoken of in Col. 3: 9, our corrupt nature, [9]the evil disposition with which we were born, reigns without opposition. In the renewed state, the new man, [10]the holy principle, a good disposition, enters. Now there is opposition—a warfare commenced,

---

1. When a man is converted, do all the christian graces exist in full maturity? 2. What duty is enjoined upon the christians? 3. Do all christians grow in grace? 4. What has God appointed for this purpose? 5. What is growth in grace called? 6. By what means are men sanctified? 7. Proof. 8 Is there any difference between being a christian and being sanctified? 9. What has possession of the heart of man by nature? 10. When renewed, what is introduced?

which every real child of God well understands. This arises [1]from the presence of two parties contending for the field. When grace triumphs, [2]obedience is the fruit; when nature is victorious, [3]disobedience is the result. Thus Paul affirms, [4]Rom. 7:, "That which I do, I allow not." The sin which I commit, my renewed nature does not approve, "for what I would,"—the good that my sanctified nature would perform—"that do I not; but what I hate,"—what my sanctified nature abhors—"that do I,"—that my sinful nature readly performs. . . . "I find then a law, that when I would do good,"—when my sanctified nature would do good—"evil is present with me,"—my unsanctified part readily leads me astray. "For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man: but I see another law in my members,"—the unrenewed nature—"warring against the law of my mind,"—the renewed part—"and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." This struggle between his sanctified and unsanctified nature, caused him sighing for deliverance to cry out, "O, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" But He who will not break the bruised reed, never suffers his children long to be thus oppressed with a sense of the burden of sin, till he points them to the deliverer, and then they

1. Whence arises the warfare in the christian experience? Could there be a warfare if there was but one party in the heart—if man was free from sin? 2. When grace triumphs, what is the fruit? 3. When nature is victorious? 4. Where does Paul illustrate the christian's experience?

exclaim with rapture, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Though full of sin in myself, I shall be delivered through Christ, from its dominion and its condemning power. So then, "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." Rom. 8: 1. [1]With every struggle the new man gains strength, and the carnal nature becomes weaker, like the house of David and the house of Saul. "There was a long war between the house of Saul and the house of David; but David waxed stronger and stronger, and the house of Saul weaker and weaker." 2 Sam. 3: 1. [2]Growth in grace is not uniform. [3]Sometimes the wind of the Lord blows upon the garden of spices —great accession of grace are added, perhaps as great and as sensible a change is produced in the christian, as when he was first renewed. [4]Such an accession Peter received after his dreadful fall, which was termed conversion. [5]Ordinarily, however, growth in grace is more uniform, like the rising sun, it shines brighter and brighter till the perfect day; or like the little leaven hid in the meal, it performs its work in a silent and unostentatious manner. In this respect "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation." Luke, 17: 20.

Regeneration and justification, though both the

1. What is the result of these repeated struggles? 2. Is the christian's growth in grace uniform? 3. What is sometimes the case? 4. What is said of Peter? 5. What is ordinary christian experience?

acts of God in a peculiar sense, and nearly related to each other, are yet different. [1]Regeneration is God's act in transforming the sinner's character. Justification is God's acceptance of the sinner, and declaring him acquitted of deserved punishment, on account of the atonement made by Jesus Christ. Justification bears some resemblance, in meaning, to pardon, only it is more full and comprehensive. [2]Justification places us beyond the power of condemnation. [3]"Their iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. 8: 12. [3]"There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Rom. 8: 1. [4]None are justified except those who have been regenerated. The *ground* of justification is not, 1st. Our own righteousness. By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Gal. 2: 16. 2d. Not our faith. The righteousness by which we are justified, must be perfect, but our faith is imperfect and not our own; it is imparted, "it is the gift of God." 3d. Nor is it obedience to the gospel requirement as to a milder law. God's law is one and unchangeable. Though man fell, the law did not change. It required perfect obedience of Adam as a rule of duty, and it requires the same of us. 4th. Nor is a profession of religion, or the performance of ever so many good works, or even of perfect obedience, the ground of justification. "By

1. What is the difference between regeneration and justification? 2. When a man is justified, can he ever again be condemed? 3. Proof. 4. When does justification take place?

grace are ye saved, . . . not of works lest any man should boast." Eph. 2: 8, 9.

[1]The only ground of our justification, is the merits of Jesus Christ. [2]By him "all that believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses." [2]"He was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification." Rom. 4: 25. [2]"Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." Rom. 3: 24. [3]Nothing that the sinner does, either before or after his conversion, is the meritorious ground of his justification. [4]The *instrument* of justification is *faith*. [5]"Therefore being justified *by* faith, i. e., as the instrumental cause, "we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5: 1. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, not by the works of the law." Gal. 2: 16. "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3: 28. These passages, and many more, show two things. 1st. That faith is necessary for justification. 2d. That it is the instrumental, not the meritorious cause of it. "Therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace." Rom. 4: 16.

---

1. What is the ground of justification? 2. Proof. 3. Do not his works in some way place God under obligation to justify the sinner? 4. What is the instrumental cause of justification? 5. Proof.

[1] The *evidence* of justification is *good works*. The tree is known by its fruits.

[2] Every gracious exercise proceeds from this principle of love, or holiness, implanted in regeneration. [3] When the prophet cast the salt into the spring, the water became sweet, and the stream issuing from it, partook of the same character. When the heart is renewed, after the image of him who created it, holy exercises arise from it. And though [4] in the order of time, every grace springs up simultaneously with the new creation in the soul, and one exists as soon as another, yet [5] in the order of nature, FAITH is the first exercise of the renewed heart. *Speculative faith*, which is [6] the mere assent of the understanding to historic records sufficiently authenticated, may have existed from the dawn of reason. Scripture truths may have been received, and believed, without producing any influence upon the heart. "Devils believe and tremble." James, 2: 19. But as the first exercise of the renewed soul, there is [7] *evangelical faith*, which is a full belief of what God has revealed concerning Jesus Christ as an atoning sacrifice. [8] A sense of one's lost and ruined condition by nature, and his need of Christ. [8] A full belief of Christ's ability and willingness to save, and a casting himself, with entire confidence,

---

1. What is the evidence of justification? 2. From what do good works and gracious exercises proceed? 3. How is this illustrated? 4. Which grace is first in the order of time? 5. Which in the order of nature? 6. What is speculative faith? 7. What is evangelical faith? 8. With what is it connected?

upon him for mercy, [8]and a cordial embracing of him in all his offices of prophet, priest and king. [1]There is a closing in with Christ, a letting go of every thing else, and accepting of, and being pleased with, him. O how lovely he appears. He never dreamed that there was a being so lovely in the universe. [2]"He is the chief among ten thousand, the one altogether lovely." [3]He *approves* of Christ, and the whole scheme of redemption—*accepts* of Christ as his portion and his all, and *trusts* in him. [4]Faith in Christ does not consist in believing that my name is written in heaven, or that I am justified. [5]There are some who make strenuous efforts to persuade themselves that they are in a justified state, [6]and fancy that they have evidence of it, if they can obtain sufficient confidence to say, I know it. [7]Observation, however, shows us that those who are most self-confident, are far from giving the best evidence that they are the children of God.

[8]The *warrant* of faith is the word of God. *Only* that which is *revealed* is a proper object of faith. God has no where revealed that my salvation is secured—that Christ died for me in *particular*—and believing it does not evince that I have true evangelical faith. It does not assure me of the conver-

1. When a convicted sinner believes in Christ, will he seek any other way of salvation? 2. How does Christ appear to those who believe in him? 3. How does he feel towards Christ's character and works? 4. Does faith in Christ assure me that my name is written in heaven? 5. Into what error does a belief in this sometimes lead men? 6. What do they think? 7. What does observation show? 8. What is the only warrant of faith?

sion of any particular individual. [1]The impression that rests upon the mind of the conversion of some particular person, is not faith, but merely an *impression*, which may be so, and may not be so. "According to thy *faith*,"—not according to thy impressions—"be it unto thee." Good or bad spirits either may produce such impressions. God's revealed will is the only warrant of faith. All who ever have been saved, or ever will be, possess the same faith. [2]Those who lived previous to the advent of the Savior, were saved by believing in a Messiah *to come*; those who have lived since, [3]by believing in him *as* come. Those who have lived since his appearance, have undoubtly clearer views, owing to superior light, than those who lived before. All, whether before or since, are saved "by grace through faith, and that not of themselves, it is the gift of God." Eph. 2: 8. That faith is the gift of God, appears from the fact that [4]the disciples prayed for it as though it came from God. [5]"Lord, increase our faith." Luke, 17: 5. "Looking to Jesus the *author* of our faith." Heb. 12: 2. "To another [is given] faith." 1 Cor. 12: 9. "The fruit of the spirit is . . . . faith." Gal. 5: 23. Phil. 1: 29. Rom. 12: 3. 2 Thess. 1: 11. [6]Faith through the gift of God, is the act or exercise of

---

1. When a strong impression of the conversion of a friend rests upon the mind, is that faith? 2. How were christians saved before the advent of the Savior? 3. How since? 4. Faith is said to be the gift of God, what evidence of it? 5. Scripture? 6. Whose act is faith?

the creature, and is a voluntary exercise of the mind. [1]Whilst there is no merit in faith, unbelief is the most ruinous and provoking of all sins, and is the reason of the condemnation of the finally impenitent. "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath *not believed* in the name of the only begotten Son of God." 1 John, 5: 10.

[2]*Evangelical repentance* is intimately and inseparably connected with faith—one cannot exist without the other. Whoever believes repents, and whoever repents believes. As conviction of sin was defined to be a heart-felt sense of personal ill-desert, as a transgressor of the good laws of the best of beings, and as an offence particularly against God, so [3]repentance is a heart-felt sorrow for sin, as committed against a holy and a just God. [4]Evangelical repentance is to be carefully distinguished from legal repentance. It is not every one that says, "I do heartily feel sorry for my sins," that truly repents. [5]"Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation *not to be repented of*, but the sorrow of the world worketh death." 2 Cor. 7: 10. The sorrow of the world, or [6]legal repentance, is a sorrow for sin on account of the consequences resulting from it. [7]The thief is sorry he stole when he is arraigned for trial. [7]The child is sorry he

---

1 Are men guilty for not possessing faith? 2. What other grace is connected with faith? 3. What is repentence? 4. From what is evangelical repentance to be carefully distinguished? 5. What is the difference, evangelical and legal repetnance? 6. What characterizes legal repentance?—7. How illustrated?

disobeyed, when the rod is raised over his head. [1]This sorrow may be real, deep and distressing, attended with a full conviction of guilt, and a frank and full confession of it, with a strong desire to make reparation, and yet be nothing but that sorrow which worketh death. [2]Judas felt all this, yet was none the better. "I have sinned," said he, "in that I have betrayed innocent blood," "and he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple and departed, and went and hanged himself." Math. 27: 3–5. [3]False repentance may approximate very near to genuine, and be very easily, as it often is, mistaken for it. True repentance includes,

1. [4]A *sorrow for sin* as *committed against God*. "Against *thee*, thee only, have I sinned." [5]Though many of his sins were against his fellow men, yet their enormity lies in their being a transgression of the laws of a holy God. And he feels sorry for them, though God should never punish him, and he exclaims, "Mine iniquities are a *heavy burden*," Ps. 38: 4; and he would repair the evil if it were in his power.

2. [6]A *hatred of sin, as committed against God*, because of its intrinsically evil nature, though it were never known by men, and a hatred and loathing of one's self on account of it. Thus Job, when

1. How near may it come to evangelical repentance? 2. Of what kind was the repentance of Judas? 3. Is false repentance often mistaken for genuine? 4. What is the first thing included in genuine repentance? 5. How does the truly penitent feel in reference to those sins more directly committed against his fellow men? 6. What is the second thing included in genuine repentance?

he saw God and his own character more clearly, "Abhorred himself and repented in dust and ashes. Behold, I am vile: what shall I answer thee?" Job, 40: 4. "I hate vain thoughts." Ps. 119: 113. It is a universal hatred of sin, and of all sin, both open and secret. Says the Psalmist, "I hate every false way." A restitution of injuries will also be made, as far as is possible. Said penitent Zaccheus, "If I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him four fold." Luke, 19: 8.

3. [1]A frank and full *confession of sin.* [2]Those sins which have been committed against our fellow men, will be confessed to them as far as practicable. But especially [3]all will be confessed to God with shame and self-abasement. "I said I will confess my transgressions." Ps. 32: 5. "Give glory to God and make confession." Josh. 7: 19. "I acknowledge my transgression, and my sin is ever before me." Ps. 51: 3. "In me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." Rom. 7: 18.

4. [4]A *forsaking of sin.* Were the nature of the swine to be changed into that of the lamb, it would forsake the mire, because it was not its element. It might fall into it, but it would not wallow there nor feel at home. Its nature is changed. The life may be reformed by a mere legal repentance—a sorrow which worketh death. Reformation is not conclu-

---

1. What is the third? 2. Should sins be confessed to men? 3. To whom should all be confessed? 4. What is the fourth thing included in repentance?

sive evidence of repentance, yet a want of reformation is conclusive against it. If we loathe sin we will forsake it. This is the great end to be attained by repentance—[1]*reformation from right motives.* [2]"If the wicked will turn from his sins, that he hath committed, and keep my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die." [3]The only evidence that we have of repentance, is *good works.* "Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance." Math. 3: 8. "For behold, this self-same thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge," 2 Cor. 7: 11; what a disposition to make restitution to the injured cause of religion, by inflicting proper punishment on offenders.

Repentance, like every christian grace, though [4]the voluntary act of the creature, one that he must perform himself, [5]is the result of the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart. [6]"In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will *give them repentance* to the acknowledgment of the truth." 2 Tim. 2: 25. [6]"Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince

---

1. What is the grand object to be attained by repentance? 2. What encouragement to repentance? 3. What is the only evidence of it? 4. Whose act is repentance? 5. Do men repent without the operation of the Holy Spirit? 6. What proof that repentance is the gift of God?

and a Savior, for to *give repentance* to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Acts, 5: 31. [1]No person repents after a godly sort, *only* as he is regenerated, and *all* regenated persons do exercise godly repentance. [1]"Surely *after* that I was turned, I repented; and *after* that I was instructed, I smote upon my thigh." Jer. 31: 17. Repentance is not merely a work connected with the new birth and then completed. *That* is its beginning, its *end* is only when the soul is freed from sin. The christian's life is a life of repentance. "My sin," said the Psalmist, "is *ever* before me." Ps. 51: 3.

Having noticed the exercises connected with regeneration, I shall give some of the evidences of such a change.

[2]A person may be very much *like* a christian; may have *great knowledge* of the Bible and of religion; have *great zeal* and *gifts*, and not be regenerate. The wicked Jehu said, "Come with me and see my zeal for the Lord." 2 Kings, 10: 16. He may [2]make *high professions*, and be thought a christian by others. It was thus with the scribes and pharisees. The Jews thought if only two men should get to heaven, the one would be a scribe and the other a pharisee. And even Judas was thought to be as good as any of the disciples.—He may *hate* sin, as the drunkard hates drunkenness after a de-

---

1. Do persons repent before they are regenerated, or after? 2. Is it possible for a person to be very much like a christian and not be one?

bauch—[2]and *confess* it—from custom, or to be thought a christian, or confess sins that are trifling, and conceal those that are enormous. He may even [2]*forsake* many sins, and appear to be an entirely different man; *perform many christian duties,* choose different company and different employments, so as to cause his neighbors to say, "Is Saul, also, among the prophets," and [2]have *another* heart, as Saul had, and yet not have a *new,* a regenerate heart. Herod did many things gladly, under the influence of John's preaching. "All these things," said the young man in the gospel, "have I kept from my youth up." [1]He may relate such a *bright experience,* and entertain such *high hopes,* as greatly to discourage the humble christian, who carefully examines every exercise of his heart, lest he be deceived, and yet his hopes be vain and his experience delusive. [2]No reliance is to be placed upon dreams, visions, sudden joy, great lights, strong impressions, turning to comforting passages of scripture, or having them suggested to the mind. It has been more frequently the whisper of satan than of the Spirit, saying, "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." Observation fully justifies the remark [3]that *remarkable experiences, ordinarily, make inconsistent professors of religion.* No hopes could have been stronger than those entertained by

---

1. May he not go even further than this? 2. Can we not place much reliance upon a remarkable experience? 3. What does observation show?

some whom the Savior represents as coming for admittance to the gates of heaven, saying, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name," &c., to whom he said, "I *never* knew you," i. e., as regenerate. *Hope* is one of those great comforts which God, in mercy, generally gives his own dear children, to cheer and encourage them in their christian course. And yet its possession makes a man's heart no better, its absence makes it no worse. Heaven will be just as sure without a hope as with, if our hearts be such as God approves. [1]He who will not serve God *without* a hope, will never obtain heaven with it. [2]A man may even *love christians* and not be one. [3]He may love them for their amiable qualities, without loving that from which their amiable qualities emanate. [4]A wicked master may love a faithful servant, and not love the religion which makes him faithful. [5]He may *endure great sufferings* on account of professing Christ, prompted by false zeal, the prospect of applause; or from the hopes of meriting something by it; or from natural firmness, an unwillingness to desist from an undertaking on account of consequences, and yet have no love for Christ. [6]Yea, a man may perform *every christian duty*, and refrain from every sin, and not be a christian; [7]the motive by which

1. Ought those who have no hope to perform christians duties? 2. Can a man love christians and yet be unrenewed? 3. How can that be? 4. What illustration? 5. How can a man suffer for it and not be a christian? 6. Do we not know that that man is a christian who performs every religious duty and refrains from every sin? 7. How is that possible?

he is governed may be entirely selfish. And it is the motive with which we perform an act, more than the act itself, that gives us a holy or a sinful character in the sight of God. [1]A servant may be exceedingly careful to obey every command of his master, and to do every thing to please him, and yet have no love for him, and do it merely to retain his place and obtain a living. He may be more careful about this, even than a son who really loves his father, yet there is a vast difference in the motive. The son acts from love, the servant for his interests.

From what has been said, it may be seen [2]that no evidence of a change of heart can be given, which may not be counterfeited. Yet [3]sufficient evidence can be given, to easily satisfy others, and at times to assure the christian himself, of his good estate, and always to give him a comfortable hope; and the true christian, instead of being disheartened, will be the more diligent in examining the evidences of his christian character.

1. [4]When we really *love to meditate* upon the character of God as a great and glorious sovereign —doing without leave his pleasure simply because it is his pleasure—when thoughts of God, and of being perfectly in his hands, are pleasant, and we are pleased with God, his attributes, dealings and

1. What illustration? 2. From what has been said what may be seen? 3. Is not this view of the danger of deception discouraging? 4. What is given as the first evidence of a renewed heart?

providences—we have reason to hope we are his children.

2. [1] *Delight* in prayer and communion with God, is evidence in our favor. The longer we have loved to pray, the stronger evidence it furnishes us of our piety. The hypocrite will pray, and take pleasure in it, for a season, but "will he always call upon God?" He who habitually neglects secret prayer has no reason to indulge a hope of heaven.

3. [2] The performance of christian duties, affords to others an evidence of our piety, but to ourselves only as we perform them as a *privilege*, rather than a duty. And [3] the habitual performance of such *secret* duties as are unseen by the world, not to keep up a hope, but because we take pleasure in them, may afford us much encouragement.

4. [4] Pleasure in reading the Bible, with a heart-felt sense of its truth and excellency, and especially a hearty approval of God's law.

5. [5] Rejoicing at the prosperity, and loving to converse on the interests of religion, and the prospects of Christ's kingdom, is evidence in our favor.

6. [6] Love to the people of God because they bear his image. True charity, that puts the best possible construction upon the faults of our brethren—an unwillingness to speak of their faults, much less to expose them.

---

1. The second? 2. The third? 3. What is said of secret duties? 4. What the fourth evidence of regeneration? 5. What the fifth? 6. The sixth?

7. [1]Desires to please God. Habitual obedience, not from fear of hell, nor for the purpose of obtaining heaven, but because we hate to offend so good a being—filial fear. Making it our ruling business and principle to act in view of pleasing or glorifying him.

8. [2]Intense desires to be like God, holy—to imitate his character—a hungering and thisting after righteousness, and a hatred of sin, as committed against God, and a forsaking it, even if God would not punish for it.

9. [3]Contrition and brokenness of heart on account of short coming. A sense of unworthiness and ill-desert—unfeigned humility. [4]Grace is spiritual sight. [5]It discovers many sins unseen by the natural eye. [6]He, therefore who sees no sin in himself, and is not broken hearted on account of it, has reason to fear that he is, as yet, totally blind.

10. [7]Growth in grace—a constant increase of holy affections. The conscience becoming more and more tender. Things that we once practiced without regarding them as wrong, are seen to be *sinful*. Duties, once thoughtlessly neglected, can be neglected no longer. All the means of grace are more and more prized and improved. The closet, the family al-

---

1. The seventh? 2. Eighth 3. Ninth? 4. What is grace said to be?—5. What does it discover? What may be inferred? *Ans.*—The more grace a man has, the more numerous his sins will appear to himself, whilst his life will appear spotless to others. 6. What do we say of the man who sees no sin in himself? 7. What is the tenth and last evidence of being a christian?

tar, the prayer meeting, the sanctuary, the sabbath and the Bible grow more in interest and are more valued. The souls of sinners are more precious—the world's salvation more important—God's glory more absorbing. Where this is the case, no one need doubt but he is a child of God, an heir of heaven. But where the reverse is true, the evidence is fearfully against him.

From a regenerated heart all the christian graces flow as streams from a fountain. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Gal. 5: 22, 23. The works of the flesh, of the unrenewed heart, are these, "Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, revellings, and such like." Gal. 5: 19–21.

Thus having shown that if any ever accept of offered mercy, it is owing to the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the heart in regeneration, I proceed to show,

5. [1]That God acts as a *sovereign* in bringing men to Christ. By which I mean, 1st. [2]That when all were just alike, and none deserved any favor, *God acted as he pleased* in bestowing mercy upon any. If he had left all to perish, he had done no injustice to any. *He had a right* to leave all, to save all, or a

1. What proposition is here laid down? 1. What is meant by God's acting as a sovereign in saving men?

part, just as he saw fit. 2d. [2]That he had the *ability* to do as he pleased. None of a company of rebels that he saw fit to subdue, were so far beyond his control that he could not subdue them, without destroying their freedom.

1. [1]God claims the right of acting as a sovereign. "[2]I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." Rom. 9: 15. [2]"I will work and who shall let [hinder] it." Isai. 43: 13. [2]"Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump, to make one vessel to honor, and another to dishonor." Rom. 9: 21. [2]"My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure." Isai. 46: 10.

2. [3]He *exercises* the *right* of acting as a sovereign. [4]He forms our bodies as he pleases, some are made strong and athletic, others weak and sickly; some of one color and size, some of another. [4]He fashions our minds as he will, he gives one a strong and vigorous intellect, another a weak and imbecile one. One is a giant in mind, another a dwarf, or even an idiot. One is created with a taste for one pursuit, another has an entirely different taste. These faculties are all capable, it is true, of unlimited cultivation and improvement, yet there exists a difference naturally. One has an ear for

---

1. What does God claim? 2. From what does this appear? 3. Does God do anything more than claim the right of acting as he pleases? 4. In what respect does he exercise it?

music, another has none. God gives one his birth in a land where he can have every facility for cultivating his mind, another is born a heathen. [4]He bestows property upon one and not upon another. One is born the heir to a kingdom, another is born the heir of poverty and disgrace, in consequence of a father's iniquity. It is represented as the height of impiety, for a man to say that he is the author of his own prosperity. Deut. 8: 17, 18. "Promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south, but God is the judge; he putteth down one, and setteth up another." Ps. 75: 6, 7. "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favor to men of skill." Eccl. 9: 11. "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord." Prov. 16: 33. [4]God acts as a sovereign in giving religious privileges to one and not to another. He has power to give to all the same privileges if he sees best, but he does not do it. To some he gives them, because it is his pleasure to give them. [1]"Not for our sakes do I this, saith the Lord God, be it known unto you." Ezek. 36: 26.

[2]He took the son of an idolator from a heathen country, and promised to bless all the families of the earth in his seed. [2]He had two sons, Ishmael

---

I. But does not God save men because he sees that they will be obedient and pious? 2. What illustrations show that he does not save men on account of foreseen goodness?

and Isaac. But says God, "in *Isaac* shall thy seed be called." [1]No other reason can be assigned for it, only God's sovereign pleasure. Isaac had two sons, and yet before they were born, God said to their mother, [2]"The elder shall serve the younger." Gen. 25: 23. Yet says God to Jacob, "I have loved you, saith the Lord God, yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? Saith the Lord, yet I loved Jacob and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." Mal. 1: 2, 3. The descendants of one became wild men, free-booters; the other, God's chosen people, the depositaries of his word and will. [3]It need not be said, that God's distinguishing grace was on account of foreseen goodness on the part of Jacob's descendants. Worse sins are recorded of Jacob's children than of Esau's. See their disgraceful, and worse than heathen, treatment of the Sheckemites, Gen. 34:, Reuben's incest, 35:, Judah's, 38:, and their uniting in selling Joseph into hopeless bondage. God himself sets this question at rest. [4]"Speak not thou in thy heart, after that the Lord thy God hath cast them out before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land, . . . understand, therefore, that the

1. What reason can be assigned for God's taking Isaac instead of Ishmael? 2. What was said of Esau and Jacob before they were born? Can you give any reason for this? See fig. 3. 3. But did not God foresee that the descendants of Jacob would be better than Esau, and therefore choose him? 4. What does God say about Jacob's being chosen on account of foreseen goodness?

Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people." Deut. 9: 4, 6. God acted as a king who had a right to do as he pleased. He has exercised the same sovereignty in all ages in the bestowment of saving grace. He bestows his grace upon the poor and despised, and often passes by the high and honorable. He passes by those who have had great advantages, and bestows his favors upon those who have had less. Those often whom we expect to see converted first, are left to perish in their sins, and those for whom hope had been long extinguished, are made the trophies of his grace. Every revival proves clearly that God acts as a sovereign in the bestowment of grace. [1] "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." Rom. 9: 15. It is not on account of any thing that men do that they are converted. [1] "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." [2] Yet he never shows mercy to those who will make no efforts for their own salvation, though it is not *for* these efforts that he saves them, but *in* them.

3. [3] When God sees fit to exercise his sovereignty, no obstacles are too great to be overcome by him. The Savior knew this when he said to the proud and stubborn scribes and pharisees, who despised his teaching, "All that the Father giveth me

---

1. Mention some texts to show that it is not on account of what they do that men are saved? 2. Are men saved then, without effort? 3. Can God subdue the hearts of men when he pleases?

shall come to me." Ignorance, superstition, and idolatry, are but small impediments to almighty power. [1] "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." "I will work and who shall hinder."

6. [2] God acts according to an eternal plan in bringing men to Christ.

1. [3] All the promises and prophesies in scripture, are proofs that God had a plan in reference to his kingdom. The seed of the woman, it was promised, shall bruise the serpent's head. The triumph of *Emanuel* shall be as the bruising of the head, compared with a slight wound on the heel. The incarnation, obedience, sufferings and death of Christ, lay at the foundation of this plan. To this all the scrifices pointed. Isai. 11: 4; 60: 3. Dan. 7: 14.

2. [4] The teachings of the Savior and the Apostles, are proof of this plan. As though the arrangements had all been made in the counsels of eternity, as indeed they had, the Savior says, [5] "All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me," "thine they were, but thou hast given them to me." "God hath from the beginning [of the world] chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." 2 Thess. 2: 13. [5] "I endure all things," says Paul, "for the *elect's* sake." 2 Tim. 2: 10. [5] "*Elect* according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctifica-

1. What promise has God made to Christ? 2. What is affirmed under head 6? 3. What is the first argument brought in proof of it? 4. The second? 5. Mention some passages that refer to a plan.

tion of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 1: 2. [5]"Whom he did foreknow, he also did *predestinate* to be conformed to the image of his son, . . . . moreover whom he did *predestinate*, them he also *called ;* and whom he called, them he also *justified ;* and whom he justified, them he also *glorified*." Rom. 8: 29, 30. [5]"Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our work, but according to his own *purpose* [plan] and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus *before the world began*." 2 Tim. 1: 9. [5]"In whom we have obtained an inheritance, being *predestinated* according to the *purpose* of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Eph. 1: 11. [5]"For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the *purpose* of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger." Rom. 9: 11, 12. [5]"All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his *purpose*." Rom. 8: 28. [5]"According as he hath *chosen* us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love, having *predestinated* us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." Eph. 1: 4, 5.

All of the above passages, and [1]many more that might be presented, show that God had a plan, and that whatever he does is but carrying it out.

3. [2]*Design*, every where apparent, shows a plan.

4. [3]The unfolding of divine providences exhibits a plan.

[4]Joseph's brethren wickedly and maliciously sold him into Egypt, where he became a servant, and was treated with the greatest cruelty for thirteen years. But said Joseph, fully confident that God had some wise plan in it, "Ye thought evil against me; but God *meant* it unto good to bring to pass as it is this day, to save much people alive." Gen. 50: 20. "For God did send me before you to preserve life," "so now it was not you that sent me hither, but God." Gen. 45: 5, 8. [4]Peter, evidently teaching that God had a plan in having his beloved Son put to death, says, "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Acts, 2: 23. "Of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for *to do* whatsoever thy hand and thy *counsel determined before to be done*." Acts, 4: 27, 28. [4]Of Pharaoh God said, "For this same pur-

---

1. Are there any other passages besides these that refer to a plan? 2. What is the third argument for a divine plan? 3. The fourth? 4. Give some illustrations of this from scripture.

pose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee." Rom. 9: 17. And of Esau and Jacob, before they were born, "The elder shall serve the younger." [4]And of Cyrus, a hundred and fifty years before he was born, "He is my shepherd that shall perform all my pleasure." Isai. 44: 28; 45: 1.

5. [1]The appointment of a day of judgment shows that God has a plan. "He hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness." Acts, 17: 31.

6. [2]That God acted according to an eternal plan, must be further evident from his *wisdom*.

[3]No wise artisan ever commenced building without a plan, and [4]surely the Almighty architect would not. The whole created universe is [5]but one vast building, whose architect is God. [6]*He* framed the vault of heaven. By his creative power those countless millions of worlds are rolling in their spheres with such awful grandeur, and with such mysterious harmony. God's *wisdom* is *infinite*. Before creation's work began, [7]he surveyed with perfect knowledge all the parts of his empire. [8]The whole plan in all its parts—the number of systems and of worlds not only, but the number, shape and

---

1. What is the fifth argument used as exhibiting a plan in the government of God? 2. The sixth? 3. What would you say of a carpenter who should commence building a house without laying out his plan? 4. Is it reasonable to suppose that God would commence creating the universe without laying a plan? 5. What is the whole created universe said to be? 6. Who is the builder? 7. As God knew so much before he began to create as now, what did he do? 8. What was embraced in his plan?

size and powers of every atom in each, must have been completely embraced in his wisdom, or [1]else his wisdom was not infinite, and if not infinite he was not God, for none other than an infinite can be God. [2]But this plan was eternally in his mind and formed a part of his infinite wisdom, he has never had a new idea or a new plan, or made any alteration in the original. "From everlasting to everlasting thou art the same."

The church of Jesus Christ is represented [3]as a building, and so are each of his saints. [4]"Ye are God's building." 1 Cor. 3: 9. [4]"Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord, in whom ye also are builded together, for a habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. 2: 20–22. [5]Now if it were necessary in the formation of the universe for God to act according to a plan, if it were impossible for him to be God without it—as indeed it is, for God must be absolutely perfect, and he could not be perfect without having every plan he ever executed completely in his mind—how much more necessary for him to act according to a plan in putting up this spiritual temple, the church of Christ. And the

1. Why was this necessary? 2. Has any new idea or plan ever entered the mind of God? 3. As what is the Church of Jesus Christ and each of his saints represented? 4. What proof? Was it necessary for God to have a plan in forming the universe? Was it not equally necessary in building his church?

plan must be [1]as perfect in the one case as the other. Not only the general outlines, but the most minute details. [2]Its size and contents, and all the materials that were to enter into its composition, and the process by which these materials were to be prepared, and how they were to be obtained—must have been embraced in it. [3]No wise man would commence building without settling his mind upon these particulars. [4]And surely God would not. He would not positively affirm [5]that the seed of the woman, Christ, should bruise the serpent's head, if he had not determined that it should be done, and had not power in his hand sufficient to ensure its accomplishment. Would God have promised Abraham, that in his seed, Christ, all the nations of the earth should be blessed, if a plan had not been devised, and its execution made certain, for blessing all the nations of the earth? I have said that all the prophesies contained in the Bible, are so many witnesses [6]that God acts according to a plan. Notice especially the predicted outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and the calling of the Gentiles. Had not [7]God determined before hand that he would pour out his Spirit on that day? surely, for he had promised it. And had he determined that it should produce any effect? surely,

1. How perfect must the plan be? 2. Must it embrace the materials and their preparation? 3. Would a wise man commence building without knowing what materials he should use, or where he could obtain them? 4. Would God? 5. What did God affirm? If he had not determined to do it, could he consistently make this promise? 6. What do the prophecies show? 7. What does the promised outporing of the spirit show?

for the prophets had described what the effect would be. And [1]it could not be reasonably supposed that he would determine that it should produce an effect, and not also determine on whom the effect should be produced. Their hearts were all alike—*all equally hated Christ.* [2]Those who doubt this are Pelagians, and think the influence of the Spirit unnecessary. Can it then reasonably be doubted [3]that it was a part of God's plan to raise up on this day a host of witnesses for Christ? "As many as were ordained to eternal life, believed." Acts, 13: 48. Has God determined that any renewed souls shall dwell forever in heaven? None can doubt it. Then most assuredly he has laid a plan so as to effect it. [4]But some say, God *merely foreknew* who would accept the offers of salvation and become the citizens of heaven. [5]The foreknowledge of God as fully proves the doctrine of election, and God's holy decrees, as their strongest advocates can desire. If God *foreknows who* will finally dwell in heaven, [6]it must be *certain* that the *number* foreknown, not a less or a greater number, will dwell there. Not one whom he foresees *in heaven* will be wanting. Again, if God foreknows an event, he must foreknow it [7]as his act or the act of another. [8]If he foreknows it as his act, it must be *certain* that he

1. Would he be likely to determine to pour out the Spirit without determining what effect it should produce? 2. Who are Pelagians? 3. What cannot be doubted? 4. What do some say? 5. What does the foreknowledge of God prove? 6. Suppose God foreknows who will be saved? 7. How only does God foreknow an event? 8. Can he foreknow it before it is certain?

will perform it, for it must be *certain* before it can be foreknown, and [1]it cannot be *certain* until God *determines*, or *decrees* to perform it.

[2]The regeneration of every soul, that God foreknows shall finally dwell in heaven, is his act. [3]"We are his workmanship, created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works." Eph. 2: 10. "Even when we were dead in trespasses and sins. If any accept the offers of salvation, it is because their minds are inclined to it by the Holy Spirit. None but a Pelagian dare say that regeneration is not the work of God. Says Mr. Wesley, [4]"The author of faith and salvation is God alone. . . . Every man, in order to believe unto salvation, must receive the Holy Ghost." If, then, the regeneration of a soul be the work of God, then at least, if God foreknows all things, [5]he must have foreknown whom he would regenerate and whom he would not. But [6]he could not foreknow whom he would regenerate, until it was certain that he would regenerate them, and it could not be certain that he would regenerate them, until he determined or purposed to do it.

This plan, of which we have spoken, embraces [7]the doctrine of election, and is what is meant by the decrees of God, viz: [8]His determining before hand—having a plan in all that he does, and that

---

1. When is an act of God certain? 2. Whose act is regeneration? 3. Proof. 4. What does Mr. Wesley say? 5. If regeneration be the work of God, what follows? 6. What else follows? Could he foreknow or purpose without a plan? 7. Having proved that God acts according to a plan, what is embraced in it? 8. What is meant by the doctrine of election and the decrees of God?

whatever he does he always meant to do. All that God ever does was embraced in this plan. If he make a world, he meant from all eternity to do it. If he regenerate a soul, which is as much his act as the creation of a world, he meant from all eternity to regenerate it.

As the doctrine of election has been greatly misrepresented and poorly understood by its opposers, I will simply say,

1. It is no part of the doctrine of election [1]that God created a part of mankind on "purpose to damn them." This is often said by those who would bring the doctrine into contempt. But we, as fully as any, believe what God on his oath affirms, "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that he turn and live." Ezek. 33: 11.

2. [2]It is no part of the doctrine of election that Christ died exclusively for the elect. "He tasted death for every man," though he secured the salvation of the elect. "He is the propitiation for our sins not only, but for the sins of the whole world." No one goes down to hell because a sufficient atonement has not been made. All who go, go rejecting eternal life freely offered, when they can accept it if they would, but they will not.

3. [3]"It is no part of the doctrine of election that the elect will be saved, let them do what they will."

1. What is not part of the doctrine of election? 2. Is it that Christ died exclusively for the elect? 3. Will the elect be saved let them do what they will?

It is no part of God's plan to save unholy men. The elect cannot be saved without a fitness for heaven. There is nothing in the doctrine of election to save men unless they comply with the terms of the gospel.

4. [1]"There is nothing in the doctrine of election that teaches us to neglect the use of appropriate means." [2]The salvation of a sinner is effected by a succession of means which are connected together like the wheels in a clock, though these means are as various as individual character. That his salvation be effected, these means must be brought successively to bear upon him; and unless these means are brought to bear upon him, his salvation will not be secured. But [3]if his salvation be a part of God's plan, these means are also as much a part of the plan, as his salvation. [4]God is not so short of understanding that he fixes the end without fixing the means to its accomplishment. God makes no promises without securing the means of their fulfillment. Men often do this to the great injury of their reputation and usefulness. We consider it a mark of folly, and it were equally foolish in God. He has not done it. The means are as sure as the end. If the means fail, so will the end; one will as soon fail as the other. [5]If my having a crop is in the plan of God, the sowing of the seed is equal-

1. Does the doctrine of election teach us to neglect the appropriate means for the salvation of men? 2. Why? 3. Suppose God had determined to save the sinner? 4. Does God fix the end without fixing the means? 5. Suppose I am to have a crop of grain?

ly and necessarily a part of his plan. [1]If the conversion of any soul is a part of the plan of God, the means necessary to his conversion is also a part of his plan. If the means are not used, he will not be converted. But if his conversion be a part of God's plan, the means will be used.

5. [2]"It is no part of election that the non-elect cannot be saved if they do as well as they can." Though it be as certain as that God sits upon his throne, [3]that "All that the Father giveth to" Christ, shall come to him, [4]it is equally certain that "*whosoever cometh to him,* [elect or no,] *he will in no wise cast out.*" Heaven and earth shall sooner pass away than for any who ever come to Christ to be rejected. Every child of Adam may come and have eternal life, if *he will.*

6. [5]It is no part of the doctrine of election that the non-elect *cannot* comply with the terms of the gospel. [5]There is no other reason under heaven why they cannot comply, but their unwillingness. And the only reason why God, by his almighty power, must come and subdue their hearts, is because they are unwilling to come to Christ. He must come and do that which the sinner is able to do, but *will not.* And when he says he cannot accept the terms of the gospel, it is the same cannot which the drunkard has, when you tell him to leave

1. Suppose the conversion of a sinner is determined? 2. Suppose the non-elect repent and believe in Christ, may they be saved? Will they do it? 3. What is certain? 4. What else? 5. Can the non-elect comply with the terms of the gospel?

off his cups. "I *cannot*," he says. Put poison in his glass and it may stand before him untouched for years. His cannot is nothing more than an indisposition, an unwillingness to leave off. So is the sinner's. If he were naturally unable, there would be no guilt attached to him if he did not accept and obey, but he is naturally able but unwilling. The Bible, from beginning to end, treats men as possessed of ample power to do what God required. I cannot multiply quotations, but all the promises and threatenings are based upon it. If men go down to hell, it is [1]because they are *unwilling*, not because they are unable to comply with the terms of the gospel.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### [2]The Saint's Perseverance in Holiness.

The doctrine of the saint's perseverance depends very much upon the doctrine proved in the last article, viz: [3]God's having an eternal plan in all that he does. All must acknowledge [4]that God knows how many will finally get to heaven, and [4]that their getting there finally, is not their work, but his. [5]"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renew-

---

1. Why are any finally lost? 2. What is the doctrine contained in this article. 3. On what does it very much depend? 4. What must all acknowledge? 5. What proof that regeneration is the work of God?

ing of the Holy Ghost." [1]If then it be the work of God, he must foreknow whether he will accomplish it or no, and [2]he cannot foreknow that he will bring them to heaven, without determining to do it, or making it a part of his plan. Here it is clear [3]that perseverance is the necessary consequence of election, or is necessary if it be a part of the divine plan. I shall, therefore, dwell but a little season on this article.

By the perseverance of the saints, is meant, negatively, 1st. [4]Not that all who profess religion will finally be saved in heaven. Multitudes profess religion who have never been renewed. [5]Nor 2d, is it meant that true saints may not be left to fall into sin. They all sin daily, and sometimes most awfully. Thus did Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon, and Peter, and fell under God's displeasure. Nor 3d. [6]Is it meant that saints, if left to themselves, will persevere. They would all fall at once, but for the grace of God. There is nothing in the nature of holiness to prevent their falling. Angels, and our first parents, though holy, fell. Nor 4th. [7]Is it meant that all who are regenerated will be saved, whether they continue in holiness or not. [8]Salvation is promised only to those who continue

1. Does God know before he performs this work, whether he will perform it? 2. How can he foreknow it? 3. What necessarily follows? 4 Do you mean by the perseverance of the saints that all who profess religion will obtain heaven? 5. That true christians may not fall into sin and backslide? 6. Or that saints, if unsustained by God's power, will persevere?—7. That christians will be saved, let them do as they will? 8. To whom only is heaven promised?

to the end. Nor 5th. Is it meant that all who are regenerated will persevere without their own exertions. All who get to heaven must fight their way. Every inch of the way must be contested ground. Perseverance implies the use of means, and of personal exertion.

The perseverance of the saints in faith and holiness, is proved,

1. By [1]the doctrine of election. [2]If any are elected, they are elected to eternal life through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth—true holiness to the end of their lives. All who are chosen from the foundation of the world to enter heaven, are also chosen to persevere in holiness, that they may enter.

2. By [3]the covenant of redemption. This was made [4]betwen the persons of the Trinity. The Father devised the plan, the Son was to make it consistent by his atonement for the Father to save all who would accept of the terms, and when all, reject them as was foreseen, the Holy Spirit was to make by his influences on the heart of those willing, whom God had given as a compensation for his sufferings. Hence, christians are said to be "bought with a price, even the precious blood of Christ." As a consequence of his sufferings, God has promised in this covenant of redemption, ([5]"I have made

1. What is the first argument to prove the perseverance of the saints?—2. How does this prove it? 3. The second? 4. Between whom was this covenant made? 5. What evidence of such a covenant?

a covenant with my chosen,") that he "shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." Isai. 53: 11. [5]The travail of his soul was, as he informs us, that "they, also, whom thou hast *given* me, be with me where I am." John, 17: 24. And says he, [5]"All the Father giveth me shall come to me," for says he, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me, And this is the will of him that sent me; that of all he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." John, 6: 37–40. Here is the position of him who cannot lie, that he will raise up at the last day those given to him—i. e., all that are embraced in the covenant.

3. [1]By the conditions of the covenant of grace. This is made [2]between God and the sinner who accepts of Christ. [3]On condition of his faith, God promises to forgive his sins, adopt him into his family and give him eternal life. "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." [4]"Whosoever believeth in him shall never perish, but have everlasting life." John, 3: 16. [4]"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Acts, 16:

---

1. What is the third argument for the perseverance of the saints? 2. Between whom is the covenant of grace made? 3. What are its conditions? 4. What promises does God make to those who join in this covenant?

39. What encouragement to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, if I may believe and then be lost? The truth is, [1]my first act of faith is the pledge of eternal life. [2]"I will make an everlasting covenant with them that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." Jer. 32: 40. Here are two engagements. 1st. [3]God will not turn away from them. 2d. He will put his fear in their hearts, that *they shall not depart from him.* See Isai. 54: 2, 10.

4. [4]The believer's *union with Christ* ensures his perseverance in holiness. When a soul is converted, it is united by faith to Christ, "as the branch is united to the vine." Christ and his members are one. [5]He is the head, they the members. Christ is "the head over all things to the church, which is his body." Eph. 1: 22, 23. But that faith which thus unites to Christ, is the gift of God. (See page 124.) And when Christ has been presented, "As many [only] as were ordained to eternal life, believed." Acts, 13: 48. Various figures are used to designate this relation, as [5]"I am the vine, ye are the branches." John, 15: 5. He is the vine—the source whence they obtain the sanctifying influences of divine grace. If the branch withers, it is because the vine ceases to supply its nourishment. If

1. Of what is the first act of faith a pledge? 2. What text proves that this covenant cannot be broken? 3. What two engagements does it contain? 4. What is the 4th argument for the perseverance of the saints? 5. What relation does Christ sustain to his people?

the branch thrive, it is in consequence of the nourishment it receives. [1]The thriving of the branch depends on the vine—the perseverance and thriving of christians depend on Christ. [2]Now surely Christ will not suffer his members to perish, when it is in his power to prevent it, when their life comes from him.

5. [3]The *intercession* of *Christ* proves the saint's perseverance, else he intercedes in vain. Having purchased us with his own blood, ("Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious blood of Christ." 1 Pet. 1: 18.) "He entered into the holy place, having obtained *eternal* redemption for us." Heb. 9: 12. "Who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Rom. 8: 34. In view of this fact, knowing that Christ never intercedes in vain, the enraptured apostle triumphantly exclaims: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ; shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? [4]Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerers, *through* him that loved us, for I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, [devils, Col. 2: 15,] nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any *other* crea-

---

1. If such be the union between it and believers, on what does their perseverance and growth depend? 2. When Christ loves them, will he let them fall? 3. What is the fifth argument for the perseverance of the saints? 4. What does the apostle conclude from this intercession?

*ture,* shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Rom. 8: 35–39.

6. [1]The perfections of God show it. Every regenerated soul is adopted into the family of God. "Having predestinated us [2]unto the adoption of children." Eph. 1: 5. Will God suffer any of the members of his family to perish, if he can prevent it? [3]He is a being of infinite love, faithfulness, wisdom and power; and all these attributes are pledged for the good of his family. [3]He has *power* to remove every obstacle in the way of their final happiness. When he renews and sanctifies their hearts, adopts and justifies them *freely* through Jesus Christ, does he not love them? Are they not dear to his heart as the apple of his eye? And does he not engrave their names upon the palms of his hands, and write them in the book of life? His is an unchangeable love, "Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end." John, 13: 1. "Yea, I have loved thee with an *everlasting* love: therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee." Jer. 31: 3.

7. [4]What God has done for the true christian, is a pledge that he will carry on the work of his own beginning. [5]"Being confident of this very thing,

---

1. What is the sixth argument? 2. To what are christians predestinated? 3. Has God power to prevent the destruction of his children? Will he suffer any to be destroyed when he can prevent it? 4 What is the seventh argument for the perseverance of the saints? 5. Will God begin a work and then leave it unfinished?

that he which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. 1: 6. "Who hath also sealed us, and given us the *earnest* of the Spirit in our hearts," 2 Cor. 1: 22; i. e. has given us [1] the pledge that what the Spirit has begun he will complete. If regeneration were the work of man—if grace in the heart were dependent on the will of man, or originated in it, then indeed he might, and would instantly, fall away and be lost forever. But grace is not a seed of human planting, "It is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." Eph. 2: 8, 9. Its growth and continuance depends not on man, as the efficient cause, but on the Holy Spirit. When we were renewed we "were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. 2: 1. What motive for God to begin a work which he knew *he* must complete or it would not be completed, unless he determined to complete it. "Ye are God's building." What man would be so foolish as to begin an edifice, and do the most laborious part, when all the time he had no thought of finishing it, and knew that unless he did finish it all his labor would be lost? Can such folly be charged on God? [2] How clearly this is shown by the apostle, "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. . . . . God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we

---

1. What has God given to his children? 2. How does the apostle draw an argument for the perseverance of the saints from the fact that he has regenerated them?

were yet sinners, Christ died for us;" hence he naturally and conclusively argues, "Much more, then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him, for if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled [made friends] to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, [made friends,] we shall be saved by his life." Rom. 5: 6, 9, 10. If God, out of love to an enemy, will make him a friend, will he not, out of love for a friend, save him finally, when this was his object in making the enemy a friend? No language can be plainer. No man can consistently believe in "falling from grace," who believes that regeneration is effected by a special and direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart. But if regeneration be the work of man, he may easily fall away.

8. [1]It is unreasonable to suppose that there is joy in heaven over a regenerated soul, if it is finally lost. There certainly can be no ground for it. It is true, that when a soul repents, it acknowledges that it has been wrong and God right; but it is also true that, should it apostatize, it says also by that act, that I have tried religion, and found it, after a full trial, to be vain and useless. And this very sentiment we find in the mouths of thousands who say, they "know all about religion, for they have *had it once* and got tired of it." And you cannot make such men believe that they were mistaken.

---

1. What is the eighth argument for the perseverance of the saints?

"Though thou shouldst bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him." Rev. 27: 22. Hence the tendency of teaching that men may fall from grace is most pernicious and soul-ruining. What men believe they are very apt to practice. Hence the unusual number of backsliders and apostates, among those that teach that men may lose their religion—be regenerated, and then unregenerated—an adopted child of God to-day, and to-morrow be disowned and disinherited—to-day have their names written in the book of life, and to-morrow have them erased.

9. [1]The historical account of God's true children, shows that every really regenerated soul will be saved in heaven. Though all are sinful, of which the scriptures speak, none perfect, "no, not one"—the Bible does not contain the history of a perfect character, Jesus Christ excepted, yet all its worthies are represented as persevering to the end. A catalogue of them is given in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, "*and these all died in faith,*" with no exception. It is true that real christians may and do fall into sins, as the lamb may fall into the mire, from which it escapes as soon as possible, because the mire is not congenial to it; yet, though they fall a thousand times, and so as dreadfully to mar their beauty, it will not make sin congenial to their natures. "For a just man falleth seven times, and riseth up again, but

1. What is the ninth argument used to prove the perseverance of the saints?

the wicked shall fall into mischief," [and not rise up again.] Prov. 24: 16. Yet if they sin, they will be chastised until they return to God. Ps. 89: 31–34.

10. [1]Positive declarations of scripture show that all who are regenerated will persevere in faith and holiness. [2]"I will make an everlasting covenant with them that I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." Jer. 42: 40. [2]"All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out, for I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me; and this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day: And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." John, 6: 37–40. [2]"My sheep hear my voice and I know them, and they follow me. And I will give unto them *eternal* life, [not life for a little while,] and they shall *never perish*, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." John, 10: 27–29. [2]"I am the bread of

1. What is the tenth and last argument used? 2. Mention some proof texts.

life, . . . If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever." John, 6: 48 : 51. [2] "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath *eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last day.*" John, 6: 54. [2] "The water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water *springing up to everlasting life.*" John, 4: 14. [2] "The path of the just is as the morning light, that shineth more and more," &c. [2] "The righteous shall hold on his way, and he that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger." Job, 17: 9. That we are kept from falling is attributed entirely to grace, we "are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." 1 Pet. 1: 4, 5. 1 John, 2: 19. Math. 7: 22, 23. Rom. 8: 38–40.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

Perfect Obedience Required by the Law of God. — The Bible our Complete Directory.

As a rule of duty the law of God requires perfect obedience of heart and life from the first moment of our accountability throughout our whole existance, without a single moment's interruption, which is the same thing as absolute perfection.

1. [1]This requisition of perfect holiness is reasonable, 1st. [2]On account of our *relation* to him as

---

1. Is it reasonable for God to require perfect obedience of his creatures? 2. Why?

creatures. 2d. On account of the excellency of his moral nature. 3d. On account of the excellency of his law and government. [1]His requirements are adapted to our wants, not merely to make us perfectly happy if obeyed, but *to our powers*. He requires nothing unreasonable, nothing but what man could render if he *would*. [2]The cause of all disobedience to God, is an *unwillingness* to obey, not a want of power to obey. Devils and men, as well as saints and angels, could obey if it were their choice. [3]God does not graduate his law to the inclinations of his creatures, nor has he altered it since the fall. [4]God required perfect obedience of Adam, both as a *rule of duty* and as the *ground of justification*. He was to be justified by his works. Of us he requires it as a *rule of duty, not* as the ground of justification. We are justified by grace through faith.

If our fall consists in a disinclination to obey, as has been shown, and God gives us a different rule because we are disinclined to obey, [5]the rule must be as various as the inclinations of men, consequently there must be a different law for every individual, and to the same individual at different times, according to his inclinations. [6]One law pervades all

---

1. Wherein does the excellency of his law appear? 2. Is there any necessity for any man to sin, or disobey God? 3. But man has fallen, does God require the same obedience of us he did of Adam? 4. On what different grounds is obedience required? 5. Wherein is the absurdity of supposing that God alters his law according to the inclinations of men, or since the fall, on account of his disinclination to obey it? 6. Has God more than one rule of duty?

God's empire. Angels, men and devils are required to render perfect obedience—to be perfectly holy.

2. [1]God could not consistently require any thing less than perfect obedience from any of his intelligent creatures. He now requires only what is just right—[2]to require less were to allow, or countenance that which is wrong, which God cannot do, for he is holy.

3. [3]This rule of duty is contained in the Sacred Scriptures. [4]The Bible is man's complete directory. It teaches him his whole duty, in reference to God and man. This embraces the two tables of the law.

I. [5]*In reference to God.* That [6]we should *fear* him. "Be thou in the fear of the Lord all the day long." Prov. 23: 17. "Who would not fear thee, O King of nations?" [6]*Love* him. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. Deut. 6: 5. [6]*Trust* in him. "Trust in the Lord and do good, so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed." Ps. 37: 3. [6]*Worship* him. "Exalt the Lord thy God, and worship at his footstool, for he is holy." Ps. 99: 5. [6]*Pray* to him. "I will that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting." 1 Tim. 2: 8.

1. Does not God exact too much in requiring perfect obedience of us sinful creatures? 2. Why? 3. Where can man find his rule of duty? 4. What is the Bible to man? 5 In reference to what does the Bible treat as our duty? 6. Name some of the duties which we owe to God?

[1]"Prayer is an offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to his will, [2]in the name of Christ, [3]with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies;" and is of various kinds, each equally a duty. I will mention *ejaculatory* prayer. This is that kind of prayer which is emphatically "the christian's vital breath." [4]It is the desires of the soul sent out to God in short sentences, and is ordinarily only mental; hence its great convenience, as it may be offered in secret and obtain a speedy answer, though we are surrounded by thousands. The christian's every breath should be a spirit of prayer. I will mention some advantages of this kind of prayer. 1st. [5]It fortifies against sudden temptation. An old writer calls it "short-arms for a christian soldier." 2d. It tends to cure worldliness. It lifts the soul from earth, and makes heaven look glorious and the world comparatively insignificant. 3d. Keeps the heart in a proper frame. 4th. It affords a great relief in affliction. 5th. And keeps God always near to us. We have a hearing with him.

[6]*Secret* prayer is retiring alone to some secret place, called in scripture [7]closet, and there statedly pouring out the soul to God. For this purpose, [7]"when thou prayest enter into thy closet, and

---

1. What is prayer? 2. In whose name are we to pray? 3. What are we to confess and acknowledge? 4. What is ejaculatory prayer? 5. What encouragement to it? Repeat all the heads. 6. What is secret prayer? 7. What direction does the savior give for it? Is praying about our business, secret prayer?

when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." Math. 6: 6. This prayer, 1st. [1]Confers great honor upon us. It is a personal interview with God. 2d. It has power with God. By the influence of Jacob's prayer, Esau's hatred was turned to love. 3d. It weakens the power of satan—tends to blast his hopes of success with the christian. The infernal powers know what they have to fear when a saint gets alone with God. 4th. It evinces the sincerity of our religion, and supports our hope. 5th. It exerts a holy influence over the life. In these private interviews with heaven, God makes his image more visible upon the soul. The world can discover it in the man who daily walks with God: and they can soon tell when this duty is neglected. 6th. The review of these seasons makes death pleasant.

[2]*Family prayer* is the assembling the whole family, domestics and all, morning and evening, and after reading a portion of the scriptures, and singing a sacred song, where it can be done, uniting in supplicating for such blessings as are needed. [3]Uniformity in the position should be observed. When the head of the family kneels, all should kneel, and good manners requires [4]that even strangers who are present, or those who make no pro-

1. What arguments for it? Repeat the heads. 2. What is family prayer? 3. What should be observed? 4. What does good manners require?

fessions of religion, should conform to the practice of the family. When the head of the family stands in prayer, all should stand.

God ranks prayerless families and the heathen together, and says he will pour out his fury upon them. Jer. 10: 25. It is useless to say that the Bible no where enjoins, by a positive command, the duty of family prayer. [1]Every precept that enjoins parents to instruct and religiously educate their children, requires them to perform this duty. God's chosen people had their morning and evening sacrifices. Whereever Abraham pitched his tent, he erected an altar and called upon the name of the Lord. Joshua resolved, "As for me and my *house*, we will serve the Lord." And our Savior often prayed with his disciples, the only family he had. Prayers in the family should be short, and for such objects as all should be interested in, and at hours when the family can most conveniently be called together. There are many encouragements to it. 1st. [2]It greatly assists in the government of our own tempers. We feel it to be inconsistent, immediately after arising from our knees, to manifest a fretful disposition. 2d. It assists in the government of the family. 3d. It promotes family piety. Piety usually continues in the line of the family, but soon becomes extinct where family prayer

1. From what do we argue the duty of family prayer? 2. What encouragement to it? Repeat the heads?

is neglected. Those who do not pray before their children, exert but little religious influence over them, and cannot rationally expect to see them converted. 4th. It greatly cements the attachment of the family circle. Scenes around the family altar are long remembered. 5th. It increases our influence in community, as christians. He who neglects family prayer, will be considered as dishonoring the religion which he professes, and his christian character, at best, will be suspected. It is well in family prayer for all who feel at liberty to take a part, when time allows, especially on sabbath evening.

*Asking a blessing* upon the food spread for our daily refreshment, is a duty for which [1]we have the invariable example of our blessed Lord and Master —and perhaps for returning thanks after meals.

[2]*Social* prayer is where two or more are united in asking the divine favor. Of its various forms I will mention only the *prayer-meeting*, which is [3]the thermometer of the church—the criterion by which you may judge of the state of religion. When the prayer-meeting is well sustained, religion flourishes and revivals are frequent. The prayer-meeting should be sustained, 1st. [4]Because it honors God, by acknowledging him in a public manner. 2d. It preserves love, unity and piety in the church. 3d. It secures public blessings upon the church and the

---

1. Whose example have we for asking a blessing upon our food? 2. What is social prayer? 3. What is the prayer meeting said to be? 4. Why should the prayer meeting be sustained? Repeat the heads.

unconverted. 4th. It promotes revivals. An increased interest in the prayer-meeting usually goes before them. 5th. It greatly strengthens the hands and encourages the heart of the minister. 6th. God greatly delights in it—the excellent of the church generally sustain them. When a day, or an hour, is set apart for a prayer-meeting, it should be remembered by the whole church. When they cannot consistently attend, they should spend a special season for it in their closet.

[1] *Praise* forms another part of our duty to God, which should by no means be neglected. *Sacred music* should be cultivated in every family as a christian duty. And public worship should be made as interesting in this respect as possible. "Sing unto the Lord, O ye saints of his; give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness." Ps. 30: 4.

[2] The Bible teaches *submission* as a duty which we owe to God. "Submit yourselves to God," James, 4: 7,—that we should be resigned to his will *when it is known*. "Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken," says pious Hezekiah, under circumstances peculiarly trying. 2 Kings, 20: 19. [2] The Bible also enjoins *humility*. "Humble yourselves, therefore, . . . . that he may exalt you in due time." 1 Pet. 5: 6. [2] It teaches us to *consecrate ourselves* to his service. "Who, then, i

1. Is singing the praise of God a duty? 2. What else does the Bible teach us?

willing to consecrate his service this day unto the Lord." 1 Chron. 29: 5. All christians are thus consecrated. "They are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." 1 Pet. 2: 9. [2]The Bible also teaches us to *consecrate our property* to the Lord, and to consider ourselves as stewards of his money. "The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of Host." Ps. 24: 1. [1]"Honor the Lord with thy substance and with the first fruits of all thine increase." Prov. 3: 9. In no age of the world has there been a greater demand upon christian benevolence, than in this. We live in a momentous epoch of time. Much will be done, and is demanded to be done, in a very short period. One year *now* accomplishes more for the world's redemption, than some previous centuries. [2]Every man's shoulder should be placed to the wheel of every important moral enterprize—*every one should do something.* The question should be asked, *how much of the Lord's money* entrusted to me should I give for this and that benevolent enterprize. [3]Our offerings unto the Lord should be *systematic,* from principle, and as much as our prayerful conscience, enlightened by a knowledge of the wants of the world, and the Bible, prompt. [4]The law required a tenth. The gospel, as a general rule, cannot require less,

1. Does benevolence honor God? 2. Ought even the poorest to do something? 3. How ought our offerings to be made? 4. As a general rule how much of our income should we give for benevolent purposes?

though this rule must be varied according to circumstances.

[1]The Bible teaches the observance of the *christian sabbath* as a duty which we owe to God. The importance of this duty, and the tendency to neglect it, makes it necessary for me to notice it more particularly. The sabbath is a day of rest from all secular pursuits and worldly pleasures, and its holy hours are to be employed in the service of God. It is both a moral and a positive institution. The separation of a portion of time for the worship of God, is dictated by the light of nature, and is a moral obligation. The amount of time, and the particular day, is known only by revelation, and is a positive obligation. The Bible informs us that the amount of time that God requires to be devoted exclusively to holy employments, is one-seventh part, or [2]one day in seven. The reasons for setting apart one-seventh part of the time for holy purposes, seems to be this: 1st. [3]Infinite wisdom saw that about this proportion of the time was necessary for rest and relaxation from ordinary pursuits, and that the best good, both of man and beast, would be promoted by sanctifying it. 2d. It was to be a type of heaven—a day of more than usual intercourse with God, and calculated for man's advancement in holiness; even while in a state of innocency. 3d. To

1. Is it our duty to observe the sabbath? 2. What proportion of the time should be kept holy? 3. Why? Give the heads.

fallen man it was to furnish an opportunity for acquiring holiness and obtaining salvation. 4th. Because of its importance to the best interests of the world, God regulated his own conduct in the creation, so as most forcibly to impress upon the minds of men the duty of sacredly regarding the sabbath. [1] He labored six days—then made a solemn pause before the universe—then blessed and sanctified that period of rest, setting it apart from other days, giving as a reason, "because that in it he had rested from all his works which God created and made." Gen. 2: 3. [2] And then to show that it was binding to all ages of the world, he wrote it with his own finger upon one of the tables of stone, and when Moses, to show his abhorrence of idolatry, broke the tables of the law, God replaced it upon another table, and then, amid awful thunderings, fire and smoke, whilst Mount Sinai shook with the presence of Jehovah, he uttered it with the rest of the commands, in the hearing of the assembled and astonished host of Israel. [3] "*Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy.* Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the *seventh day* is the sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do *any work, thou* nor *thy son,* nor *thy daughter, thy manservant,* nor *thy maid-servant,* nor *thy cattle,* nor *thy*

1. How did God teach the observance of the sabbath by example? 2 What intimation that the sabbath was to be perpetually binding? 3. Wha is the fourth commandment?

*stranger* that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20: 8–11. [1]He showed how much value he set upon the observance of this day, by commanding the man, who, unnecessarily and wilfully broke it by gathering sticks, to be stoned to death. The greatest blessings are promised to the faithful observance of the sabbath. And where the sabbath is observed, there is invariably a respect for all God's commands. [2]"If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure, on my holy day, and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasures, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob, thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isai. 58: 13, 14. The greatest curses are connected with trampling upon the sabbath. [3]"Thus saith the Lord, take heed to yourselves and bear no burden on the sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem, neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath day, neither do ye any

1. Does God regard the sabbath as a valuable institution? 2. What blessing is promised to a faithful observance of the sabbath? 3. What is threatened if the sabbath is disregarded?

work, but hallow ye the sabbath day as I commanded your fathers. . . . And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the sabbath day, but hallow the sabbath day to do no work therein, then shalt there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David. . . . But if ye will not hearken unte me, to hallow the sabbath day, . . . . then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." Jer. 27: 21–27. [1]The sabbath should be kept with the most sacred regard. [2]Suitable preparations should be made so as not to encroach upon its sacred hours. [3]*We* should perform no servile labor upon God's holy day. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work." "*In earing and in harvest shalt thou rest.*" Nor should we suffer those in our employ to do it. [4]Nor should the *stranger* or friend who puts up with us, be suffered to do that which we do not allow ourselves or family to do. [5]If sabbath-breaking be allowed on our premises; or if we suffer our cattle, or any thing that belongs to us, to be used on the day of rest, we are guilty of disobeying the fourth commandment. [6]All travelling on business or pleas-

---

1. How should the sabbath be kept? 2. Should our clothes, boots, shoes, &c., be got in readiness before the sabbath? 3. What should we not do? 4. What is said of the stranger that puts up with us? 5. What is our duty in reference to our premises, horses, cattle, wagons or harness.—6. What is prohibited?

ure, all visiting from house to house, making calls, strolling the fields, walking the streets, conversing upon wordly business, reading irreligious works, or allowing worldly thoughts, is also a violation of this command. [1]The whole sabbath, in order to be kept holy, should be spent in religious duties, such as public worship, secret devotion, meditation and prayer, and studying the scriptures, with the reading of proper religious books, and in works of necessity and mercy when they cannot consistently be performed on any other day.

The Jews were commanded to observe [2]the seventh day [3]in commemoration of the creation of the world, and of God's resting on that day. [4]Christians now observe the *first*, [5]in commemoration of a greater work—the work of redemption and of the resurrection of Christ. No express command has ever been given for this change. Yet the following reasons are satisfactory: 1st. [6]Christ arose from the dead on the first day of the week. 2d. The apostles and primitive christians observed it. 3d. It is called the Lord's day. Rev. 1: 10. 4th. The Lord himself, before his ascension, met with the disciples for worship, on several occasions, on the evening of that day. John, 20: 19, 26. [7]This last is the argument used for the observance of sabbath evening instead of Saturday evening.

1. How should the sabbath be spent? 2. What day did the Jews keep? What day was the seventh? 3 Why did they keep the seventh day? 4. What day do christians keep? 5. Why? 6. What reasons for the change of the day from the seventh to the first? Repeat the heads. 7 The Jews kept the evening before the day, why do christians keepit after the day?

That the sabbath should be had in perpetual remembrance, is argued,

1. [1]From its being written on one of the tables of *stone* with the other commands, all of which are acknowledged to be perpetually binding.

2. From the division of time into weeks of seven days each, extending over the globe, as if to make it easy to observe the seventh.

3. From the fact that there was no reason why a Jew should keep the sabbath, that does not exist for the keeping of it by a Gentile.

4. From the fact that man's physical and moral nature both, need about this proportion of time for relaxation from ordinary labors.

5. From its importance in humanizing and evangelizing the world. In regions where the sabbath is disregarded, man is next to a heathen.

The christian sabbath and the Bible are the bulwarks of our free institutions and our religion. Where there is no sabbath, it is exceedingly doubtful if there is any evangelical piety.

The last duty which we owe to God, that I shall mention, is the *study of his word*. [2]The Bible, the *whole Bible*, may, and ought to, be possessed and studied by every individual. [3]All should be so familiar with it as to understand its leading truths, and not depend upon another for a knowledge of

---

1. What arguments show that the sabbath should be kept strictly now as under the law? Repeat the heads. 2. Ought all to possess and study the Bible? 3. How familiar ought all to be with the scriptures?

what it contains. The practice of [1]the Roman Catholic clergy in keeping the common people ignorant of the scriptures, or teaching them that they are not capable of understanding them, is *soul-ruining*, and also derogatory to the character of God. [2]As if a communication made *for* the people, could not be understood by them. [3]"Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." The command is general—to one as much as another. [4]Every thing that is valuable in this life, as well as that which is to come, urges the duty of studying God's holy word.

The Bible is not only our complete directory in reference to the duties which we owe to God, but,

II. [5]In reference to man—to ourselves. "There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy good in his labor." Eccl. 2: 24. [6]It is the christian's privilege to obtain as much *real* enjoyment from the world as possible. [7]The Bible only restrains the unnatural and abusive indulgence of the gifts of a bountiful providence. Every man may have his own wife, but he should cleave to her and to her alone. [8]All lewdness in thought, word or action, is an abuse of this relation. The Bible

1. Who withhold the Bible from the common people? Is it right to do it? 2. How is it derogatory to the character of God? 3. What command is given to all? 4. What urges the study of the Bible? 5. To whom, besides to God, does the Bible teach our duty. 6. What is the christian's privilege? 7. What only does the Bible restrain? 8. What is an abuse of the marriage relation?

teaches us to be *temperate*. [1] "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving." 1 Tim. 4: 4. "We may use a little wine for our stomach's sake," in case of sickness. 1 Tim. 5: 2, 3. Yet, [2] "He that loveth pleasure shall be a poor man," Prov. 21: 17, in soul and body both. "Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine, they that go to seek mixed wine. Look not on the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright; at the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." Prov. 23: 29–33. [3] "Wo unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink, that continue until night, till wine inflame them." Isai. 5: 11.

[4] The Bible teaches us to be *industrious*. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work." Ex. 20: 9. "Seest thou a man diligent in business; he shall stand before kings, he shall not stand before mean men." Prov. 22: 29. "Let him that stole, steal no more, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." Eph. 4: 8. "We beseech you [as a christian duty] that you

1. Is it right to use fermented liquor as a medicine? 2. Is it right to use it as a beverage for our pleasure? 3. What is said of morning dram drinkers? 4. Is it the duty of men to labor?

study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with *your own* hands; that ye may walk honestly towards them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing." 1 Thess. 4: 11, 12. The direction is, "That if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy-bodies. Now them that are such, we command and exhort, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work and eat their own bread, . . . and if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." 2 Thess. 3: 10-12, 14. The christian should be a driving man, a man of *thrift* and perseverance in all matters. "Not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." Rom. 12: 11.

The law of God is our directory in reference to others—to christians. [1] "See that ye love one another with pure hearts fervently." 1 Pet. 1: 22. Envy no man, speak evil of none, put the best possible construction on every action. "Laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocricies, and envies, and all evil speakings." 1 Pet. 2: 1. [2] "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye?

1. What is our duty in reference to christians? 2. How are we to treat our enemies?

do not even the publicans the same?" Math. 5: 44, 46. [1]We are to injure no person not merely, but to do all in our power to *prevent* men from *injuring themselves.* We should seize the knife from the hand of him who would take his own life, or the life of his neighbor. [4]"Wo unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that puttest thy bottle to him. . . . The cup of the Lord's right hand shall be turned unto thee, and shameful spewing shall be on thy glory." Heb. 2: 15, 16. *The duty of husbands* is pointed out. [4]"Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ loved the Church." Eph. 5: 25. See v. 28. "Husbands, dwell with your wives according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife as the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered." 1 Pet. 3: 7. [5]*Wives* are enjoined to "submit yourselves unto your husbands as unto the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church." "Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands, in every thing." Eph. 5: 22–24.

The *duty* of *parents* to children, is pointed out. [6]"Parents ought to lay up for their children."

---

1. Is it right for us to permit men to injure themselves if we can prevent it? 2. Is it right for us to furnish a knife for a man to destroy himself? 2. What does God say of him that puts the intoxicating cup into the hand of his neighbor? 4. How should husbands treat their wives? 5. What is the duty of wives? 6. What is the duty of parents?

2 Cor. 12: 14. "If a man provide not for his own, especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." 1 Tim. 5: 8. [1]They are to *pray for* them and *with* them, and *instruct* them. [2]"The fathers to the children shall make known the truth." Isai. 37: 19. Gen. 18: 19. Ex. 10: 2. [3]"And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Deut. 6: 6, 7. Ex. 12: 26, 27, and 13: 8. Josh. 4: 20–24. [4]Parental instruction is the most efficient means that God has appointed for building up the Redeemer's kingdom. Parents are not to provoke their children, or to encourage them to engage in strifes with each other. "Provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6: 4. When necessary they are to correct them. [5]"He that spareth the rod hateth his son, but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes." Prov. 13: 24. "Chasten thy son, while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying." Prov. 19: 18; 22: 15; 23: 13, 14; 19: 15. [6]Parents should be

1. Is that all? 2. How does God expect to have a knowledge of religion perpetuated? 3. What is said in Deut. 6: 6, 7? 4. On what are we mostly to depend as the means of building up the Redeemer's kingdom? 5. Ought the rod to be used as a means of correction? May it not be used too much? It may, so as to destroy the end for which it is used. 6. What is the duty of parents in reference to marrying their children?

careful to have their children, if possible, marry into religious families. [1]By it many temptations will be avoided, and true piety will be more likely to be promoted. [2]"Swear by the God of heaven," said Abraham to his servant, "that thou wilt not take a wife to my son of the daughters of the Canaanites." Gen. 24: 2, 3.

The *duty* of *children* to parents, is taught in the sacred scriptures. [3]"Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Great stress is laid upon this command, "it is the first with *promise*." "Children obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right." Eph. 6: 1. [4]"Cursed be he that setteth light by his father or his mother, and all the people shall say, amen." Deut. 27: 11. Disobedience or unkindness to parents is a most God-provoking sin. Prov. 30: 17. [5]*Masters* are not to "oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren, or of strangers." Deut. 24: 14. "The wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning." Lev. 19: 13. They are to "forbear threatening," Eph. 6: 9, and to treat their servants with kindness, "knowing that their master also is in heaven," and "there is no respect of persons with him." A good servant is made better by

1. Why? 2. What example of this kind have we in the Bible? 3. What is the first commandment with promise? 4. Is unkindness to parents a sin which God will punish? 5. What is the duty of masters to their servants?

kindness. The *duty* of *servants* is laid down. [1] "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters, according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will, doing service as unto the Lord, and not to men; knowing that whatever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free." Eph. 6: 5–8. "Exhort servants to be obedient to their masters, and to please them in all things, not answering again; not purloining, [taking trifling things that do not belong to them,] but showing all good fidelity, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things." Tit. 2: 9, 10.

[2] *Oppression*, that horrible system that fetters the human soul, and makes the image of God a thing, a brute, to be bought and sold, finds no countenance in the blessed word of God. [3] Every principle laid down in the Bible strikes a death blow at the practice of enslaving a fellow man. [4] "Wo unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." Jer. 22: 13. [4] "Is not this the fast I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free, and

1. Of servants to their masters? 2. Does the Bible tolerate oppression? 3. What effect have the principles of the Bible on slavery, when carried out? 4. Mention some scripture that condemns slavery?

that ye break every yoke." Isai. 58: 6. [4]"Deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, and do no wrong; do no violence to the stranger, to the fatherless, nor to the widow." Jer. 22: 3. The Bible teaches the duty of *magistrates*, and our duty in reference to them. [1]Rulers are "not to respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty." Lev. 19: 15. [2]The practice of bestowing offices upon favorites, is as sinful as it is subversive of the interests of our nation. [3]The practice of laboring to get certain men into office, so as to be rewarded, is dearly contrary to scripture. [4]"Thou shalt not take a gift, for a gift blindeth the wise and perverteth the words of the righteous." Ex. 23: 8. [4]"He that receiveth gifts overthroweth the land." Prov. 20: 5. [5]Offices under the control of rulers should be conferred upon those most worthy, not on those who labor most for a particular man or party. [6]Christians ought not to support party irrespective of religious principle. They are to elect *good* men to office. [7]"Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as *fear* God; men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them to be rulers." Ex. 18: 21. [8]"He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of

1. What is the duty of magistrates? 2. Is it right for rulers to bestow offices on favorites, except for their good qualities? 3. Is the practice of laboring to put men into office so as to obtain "the spoils," in accordance with the word of God, or for the best good of our nation? 4. What scripture condemns it? 5. On whom should offices, under the control of rulers, be conferred? 6. Should a christian go with a party to do wrong? 7. Is it the christian's duty to cast his vote for a bad man for a ruler? 8. What should be the character of a ruler?

God." 2 Sam. 23: 3. [1]When men sacrifice principle to party, God will chastise the nation by giving them rulers to scourge them. "I gave them a king in mine anger and took him away in my wrath." Hos. 13: 11. [2]We should act in the fear of God in choosing rulers. Then [3]*pray* for them, "For all that are in authority," 1 Tim. 2: 2, and *obey* them and the laws of the land, where they do not conflict with the law of God. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." Rom. 13: 1. But when human laws conflict with the laws of God, [4]we may answer as did Peter and John, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye." Acts, 4: 19.

The duty of ministers is made plain by the Bible. [5]"Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God." Acts, 20: 28. [6]"Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." 2 Tim. 2: 15. [7]"In meekness instructing them that oppose themselves." [8]"Preach the word, be instant in season and out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine." "Labor in word and doctrine."

---

1. What will be the consequences of sacrificing principle to party in choosing rulers? 2. By what should we be governed in choosing rulers? 3. What is our duty to rulers? 4. Suppose the laws of the land conflict with the laws of God? 5. What is the duty of ministers? 6. Ought ministers to spend much time in study? 7. Ought they to be humble? 8. What is their great business?

1 "*Hold fast the form of sound words.*" 2 "A bishop must be blameless as the steward of God, not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre, but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, *holy*, temperate; holding fast the faithful word, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince gainsayers." Tit. 1: 7–9. An awful responsibility rests upon ministers. "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thy hand." Ezek. 3: 17, 18. And corresponding responsibilities rest upon hearers.— 3 "Remember them that have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose faith follow considering the end of their conversation. 3 Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls as they must give an account." Heb. 13: 7, 17. 3 "Esteem them highly in love for their work's sake." 1 Thess. 5: 13. 3 They are to *pray* for them that they may speak boldly as they ought to speak."

---

1. Ought they to be zealous for the truth? 2. What should be the character of a bishop? Who are bishops? Every pastor is a bishop. 3. What is the duty of people to their minister?

Eph. 6: 18–20. [3]And to *support* them. [1]"If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we reap your carnal things?" "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple, and that they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." 1 Cor. 9: 11, 13, 14.

Indeed all the duties which we owe to God, to ourselves, or our fellow men, are clearly and fully taught in the scriptures. I will, therefore, only add. [2]That every individual is under personal obligation to labor—do what he can for the salvation of men. [3]Every man should live as though Christ's kingdom would receive its character from his conduct.—[4]Should labor as though the salvation of the world depended upon his personal efforts; and [5]yet feel that success must come from God alone.

### USE OF CREEDS OR CONFESSIONS.

Though the Bible is our complete directory in doctrine and duty, yet each of our churches adopt a brief summary of what they consider the most important doctrines of the Bible, that those who wish to unite with us, may know at a glance, the leading articles of our belief. These summaries are not to supercede the Bible, but are simply a statement

---

1. What proof that the minister should be supported? 2. What is the duty of every individual? 3. How should he live? 4. How labor? 5. How feel?

of what we believe the Bible to teach. We think them important.

1. [1]To secure the peace and unity of each individual church. [2]If all the various denominations, who profess to draw their belief from the Bible, were merged into one church, they could never agree in the support of a minister: his views must necessarily conflict with many of his people. If he preached universal salvation—denied the divinity of Christ, &c., orthodox christians could not support him. If he preached according to the views of the orthodox, others could not support: there could be no harmony among the members.

2. The scriptures require us [3]to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," "to hold fast the form of sound words." If this was the case in such a church as we have supposed, what would be the result but a constant warfare? Each one professing to believe the Bible, would contend for what he believed to be the truth. Thus there would be contentions about the Trinity; contentions about justification, about the necessity of the Spirit's influence to change the heart; contentions about baptism, about election, and about all the doctrines where there is a disagreement among different denominations. A summary of what each believes to be contained in the Bible, forms a nu-

1. Why is a summary of Bible doctrines necessary to be adopted by the churches? 2. Why cannot all denominations come together and have one minister, as they profess to take the Bible for their guide? 3. What do the scriptures require of us?

cleus around which those of the same faith may gather and live in unity.

3. It is due to other churches, and to the world, [1]that each one have his articles of faith published. The world then can see what doctrines believed make men the most consistent and useful. And it gives any one, wishing to unite with any particular church, an opportunity of knowing what that church believes the Bible to teach. Besides, such written and published articles of faith, tend to unite orthodox churches, and promote christian fellowship. The doctrines of every church are liable to gross misrepresentations, at best, and especially so when not published. When published, we can see that the difference of belief in the various churches called orthodox, is but trifling after all, and all christian hearts will greatly rejoice when they see how nearly alike they all hold the doctrines of grace. [2]I am fully convinced that christian unity would be greatly promoted, did the different churches fully understand each other's belief.

Each church, therefore, among us, has a summary of their articles of faith published, to which is annexed their Covenant, that all may see what they believe and how they covenant to live. Individuals who come into our churches, come, or ought to come, with their eyes open. If they cannot believe

---

1. What is due to other churches and the world? 2. What would promote unity among evangelical christians?

and engage to live as we engage to live, we do not want them to unite with us. Whilst separate from us, they are at liberty to do as they please. But when they voluntarily take the oath of God upon them to endeavor to live as set forth *in* the Covenant, let them not dare to perjure themselves before high heaven. If their views become changed, so that they feel that a home some where else is preferable, let them make it known and take an orderly departure, but whilst with us, let their influence be felt where they have covenanted to walk.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

[1] Baptism. — The Lord's Supper.

These are the sacraments in the church, ordained [2] by Christ himself. [3] Christian baptism is the application of water to the person baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a duly authorised minister of the gospel.

[4] "Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered [5] by pouring or sprinkling upon the person." [Confession of Faith.]

[6] This has been the belief of a very great majori-

1. What are the sacraments in the church? 2. By whom were they ordained? 3. What is christian baptism? 4. Is dipping the person in water necessary to a right performance of the ordinance? 5. How is baptism rightly administered? 6. Has these modes been practiced by any considerable portion of the church?

ty of the christian church in every age. Yet [1]this belief of the mass of the church has been very strongly opposed by some modern writers, and most successfully defended. The arguments in its defence have been exceedingly numerous. I shall, therefore, mention but a few, which to my mind are satisfactory, whilst I may, perhaps, omit those which to others are much stronger.

I. [2] *The meaning of the ordinance does not demand the idea of dipping, or immersion, but is rather against it.* [3]A prominent meaning of baptism is that of a *sign*, or *seal*, and seems to have been appointed of God as the *external sign* [4]of *internal* purification, and [5]a seal of the covenant of faith, and is, therefore, a symbol of [6]the purifying operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart. Baptism is not purifying, but the symbol of it. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." [7]The blood, shed under the Old Testament dispensation, typified the blood of Christ. [8]The various ceremonial purifications by means of this blood, and other purifying agents, were typical of the *application* of the blood of Christ by the Holy Spirit. [9]The per-

---

1. Has baptism by sprinkling or pouring been opposed? 2. Does the meaning of the ordinance seem to make dipping necessary? 3. What is its meaning? 4. Of what the sign? 5. Of what the seal? 6. What does it represent? 7. What did the blood of the animals slain under the Mosaic dispensation typify? What is a type? Ans.—A figure, or representation, of something to come? 8 Of what were the various ceremonial purifications typical? 9. By what mode was ceremonial purification performed under the law?

sons, or things, to be ceremonially cleansed under the law, were not dipped or immersed in the purifying agent, but the agent, whether it was blood or water, or the ashes of an heifer, were either sprinkled or poured upon the person or thing to be purified. A few passages of scripture will show that purifying under the law was not performed by dipping in water, but more generally by sprinkling or pouring. When the leprous person was to be cleansed, the following command was given to the priest: [1] "He shall *sprinkle* upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy, seven times," of the slain bird." Lev. 14: 7. [1] After he was cleansed and made whole, the priest, holding some oil in the palm of his left hand, was to "dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and *sprinkle* of the oil seven times before the Lord." v. 16, and again v. 27. [1] When the leprousy had infected a house, the priest was to take the blood of a bird, as in the case of a leprous person, "and *sprinkle* the house seven times. v. 15. [1] When a typical atonement was made for sin, Aaron was commanded to "take the blood of a bullock, and *sprinkle* it with his finger upon the mercy-seat," Lev. 16: 14, for himself, then to take the blood of a goat "and *sprinkle* it upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat" for the people. v. 15. [1] When the Levites were to be set apart to the priestly office, Moses was

1. What proof of this?

commanded to cleanse them by *sprinkling* the "water of purifying upon them." Num. 8: 7. [1]Having contracted ceremonial uncleanness by touching a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave, in order to be made clean, they were to take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification, and mingle it with *running* water, and a clean person was to *sprinkle* it upon the tent in which the unclean lived, and upon all the vessels in the tent, and upon the person defiled, and again upon the third and seventh day was the water of reparation to be *sprinkled* upon the unclean person. Num. 19: 18, 19. The apostle sets the manner applying the purifying agent at rest, and gives us abundant intimation that the purifying under the law was typical of the purifying under the gospel. [1]"For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and . . . *sprinkled* both the book and all the people saying, This is the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover, he *sprinkled*, likewise with blood, the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. [2]And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that [3]the *patterns* of things in the heavens should be purified [4]with these, [the blood of calves

1. How does Paul say that this ceremonial purification was performed under the law? 2. How does he say that almost all things were purged? 3. Of what was the furniture of the tabernacle a pattern? 4. With what was this furniture, &c., cleansed?

and goats,] but [1]the heavenly things themselves, [christians,] with better sacrifices than these," [even the blood of Christ.] Heb. 9: 19–23. [2]Isaiah, with his eye resting upon the purifying work, which Christ, by the influences of the Spirit, should perform, says: "So shall he [Christ] sprinkle many nations," in purifying them by his Spirit. Isai. 52: 15. Ezekiel, also, predicting the blessings that should come upon the Jews, in their final restoration, when a new heart should be given them and a new spirit put within them, says: [3]"Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you." Ezek. 36: 25. The prophet Joel, alluding to the same purifying under the gospel by the Spirit, says: [4]"I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," &c. Joel, 2: 28. Peter says that this wonderful outpouring of the Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, "is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel." And [5]he calls it the baptism of the Holy Ghost. "As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning; then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John, indeed, baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized *with* [not *in*] the Holy Ghost."

---

1. How were the heavenly things [christians] themselves to be purged? In what manner were the patterns cleansed? Is it not reasonable to suppose that christians were cleansed in the same mode as their patterns? 2. Does Isaiah refer to baptism under the gospel by sprinkling? 3. What does Ezekiel say of the purifying under the gospel? 4. What does Joel say of it? 5. What does Peter call this outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost?

Acts, 11: 15, 16. Here the purifying operation of the Holy Spirit is called baptism; and this purifying work was typified [1] by the blood *sprinkled*, or *poured*, upon that which was to be cleansed. "Ye are come," says Paul, "to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to [2] the blood of *sprinkling*, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Heb. 12: 22–24. Here the blood of Christ is called the blood of sprinkling. For [3] if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer, *sprinkling* the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God." Heb. 9: 13, 14. Thus saith Peter, of the the christians scattered over the provinces of Asia, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and [4] *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 1: 2. [5] The sprinkling of water represents the application of the blood of Jesus Christ. Paul speaks of the purified heart as one that is "*sprinkled* from an evil conscience." Heb. 10: 22. [6] The blood of the Paschal lamb, *sprinkled* upon the door posts, typified the blood of *sprinkling* applied to the sinner's heart. [7] The destroying an-

1. How was this purifying work typified? 2. What does Paul call the blood of Christ? 3. How does Paul make the comparison between the blood of beasts and the blood of Christ? 4. How does Peter represent the blood of Jesus Christ, as applied? 5. What does the sprinkling of water represent? 6. What did the blood of the Paschal lamb typify? 7. Wherein s the resemblance between the blood of the Paschal lamb and the blood of Christ?

gel passed over the house where the blood had been sprinkled, so divine justice passes over the sinner to whose heart has been applied the blood of sprinkling"—i. e., Christ.

From these passages may be seen, 1st. [1]That the ceremonial purifications under the law, were performed, not by dipping, but by sprinkling or pouring. 2d. That they were typical of the purifications under the gospel—of the blood of Christ applied by the Holy Spirit. And 3d. That water baptism is the external sign of what they were the types—purification through the blood of atonement, by the Holy Spirit. And hence, 4th. We may fairly infer that that mode of administration is most scriptural, that bears, in its application, the greatest analogy to the thing signified—to the manner of the Spirit's application, which, surely, is not by dipping or immersion, but by sprinkling or pouring. [2]For the Holy Spirit, the agent in applying the blood of Christ, is represented as being *poured out*, Joel, 2: 28—*shed down*, or *on*, Acts, 2: 33, Tit. 3: 6—*descending upon*, Luke, 3: 22—*falling upon*, Acts, 10: 44; 11: 15—*coming upon*, Acts, 19: 6—as being *sent down* from heaven; and we are said to be baptized with, but not dipped or immersed in, the Holy Spirit. But baptism being a *seal* of the righteousness of faith, the amount of water does not

1. What do we learn from these passages? 2. How are the influences of the Holy Spirit represented as being applied?

affect its validity. A small seal answers all the purposes in law of a large one, so does a little water in baptism.

II. [1] *The word used in the Greek to denote baptism, does not show us that dipping the person in water is necessary.* Without turning aside to notice the arrogant assertions that have been made, by the ignorant or designing, I shall give the facts in the case in as brief a compass as possible.

[2]The command of our blessed Lord and master is, "*go*," "teach," "baptizing." Math. 28: 19. [3]The mode of going, whether it shall be on horses, mules or camels, or on foot, is not pointed out; but *go* they must. So [4]the mode of teaching is left undetermined. It may be oral or written instruction; it may be given standing, sitting, or walking, and yet the command be fully obeyed. [5]So of baptizing, *the thing to be done* is commanded, the mode of doing it is left to be decided by circumstances or convenience. It may be performed by dipping the whole body, a part of the body, or merely the head, by pouring or sprinkling the water upon the person; it may be performed standing, kneeling, sitting, or lying, and the command be fully obeyed.

To show that the Greek word, *baptizo*, does not *always* mean to dip, or immerse the whole body in

1. Can any thing be determined by the word baptizo as to the mode of baptism? 2. What is the command? 3. Is the mode of going made a matter of duty? 4. Is the mode of teaching? 5. Of baptizing? It was customary for Jesus and his disciples to go on foot, wearing sandals; is it not as reasonable to require all ministers to go in ■ particular manner, as to require them to baptize in ■ particular manner?

water, I will refer to its use in classic, and also in sacred Greek, as the Greek of the Bible is called.

Diodorus Siculus uses it in the sense to [1]overwhelm. Says he, "the river, borne along by a more violent current, [*ebaptize,*] overwhelmed many." He also speaks of land animals being [*baptizomena*] overwhelmed and destroyed by the overflowing of the Nile. Here is no idea of dipping, or of immersing; the water comes over the men and animals destroyed, but they are not dipped or immersed in it. Homer, Hypocrates and Arrian, use it in the sense to [2]dye, or color. In the fable of the battle of the frogs and mice, a mouse is represented as dyeing, or coloring the lake with his blood, and yet the Greek is "*ebapteto aimati limne*"—baptized the lake with blood. Hypocrates, speaking of a fluid with which garments are dyed, says, "When it drops upon the garments they are [*baptetai,* baptized] dyed." Again in Arrian, "The Indians *baptontai,* [baptize, color] their beards." [3]Baptizo is compounded with other words which show that it means sometimes to color, or dye, or even to plate with gold, as *porphureo-baphes,* huakinthino-baphes, of a purple, or hyacinthine, dye. Chruso-baphes, colored with gold, or gilded. *Bapheus,* (Greek,) means a dyer; baphion, the workshop of a dyer.

---

1. In what sense does Diodorus Siculus use the word baptize? 2. In what sense Homer, Hypocrates and Arrian? Could a lake be immersed in the blood of a mouse? Would the dropping of a coloring fluid upon a garment, be immersion? Do the Indians immerse their beards? 3. What is said of the compounds of baptizo?

This may be seen by turning to these words in any Greek lexicon. It is clear, then, that *baptizo*, as used by classic writers, does not always mean immerse.

An illustration of its use in sacred Greek is seen in Ecclesiasticus, 34: 25. "He that washeth [Greek, baptizeth] himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washing." Here we have the sense of the word explained. [1] "He that *baptizeth* himself, . . what availeth his *washing*." [2] Showing that washing is used as equivalent to baptizing, whilst the great idea is *purifying:* as may be seen by a reference to Num. 19: 18, 19, when purification, after having touched a dead body, a bone, or one slain, was commanded to be performed by *sprinkling* running water, mingled with the ashes of an heifer, upon the unclean. [3] *Babtizing* here means *purifying*, and was performed by *sprinkling*. [4] And if it can be shown that baptize means any thing else than plunging, or immersion, in *one* case, then the use of the word "baptizo" does not prove that immersing the person in water is *necessary* to a performance of the ordinance of baptism. All the discussions on this subject that have ever been held, turn on the *absolute necessity of putting the whole body under water*, in order to baptism, and to allow of christian fellowship.

---

1. In what sense is it used in Ecclesiasticus? 2. To what is it equivalent? 3. What does baptize mean in this passage? 4. What only is necessary to prove that the word baptize does not determine the mode?

[1]To cleanse a leper, God commanded, Lev. 14: 4–6, that he should take two birds, cedar wood, scarlet and hyssop, and slay one of the birds in an earthen pot, over running water, and then baptize [translated dip] the living bird, the cedar wood and the hyssop in the blood of the slain bird! Could there be blood enough from one slain bird, to immerse a living bird, a quantity of cedar wood, a bunch of hyssop, with some scarlet cloth? If not, baptize does not always mean immerse.

Here is evidence enough to prove that baptize does not *always* mean immerse, more is at hand. [2]Judith, we are informed, washed [Greek baptized] herself [epi tes peges] at a fountain," or spring of water, not in a fountain. The disputed word [3]*baptizo*, is a derivative from *bapto*, [4]and does not convey its full meaning, as [5]blackish, whitish and bluish, do not mean of as deep a color as black, white or blue. If blackish means *black*, and whitish means *white*, what does black or white mean? If *baptizo* means to put the subject to which it is applied entirely under water, what does *bapto* mean? [6]The primary meaning of *bapto* is to dip, but intensive as that word is, *it does not always* mean to dip, [7]it also has the meaning *to dye*, or *color*, even in classic usage, as I have shown. For the Indians color,

---

1. Have we had this proof? 2. Can any more be found? 3. From what is baptizo derived? 4. Does it convey all the meaning of the primitive? 5. Illustrate it. 6. Bapto has a stronger meaning than baptizo, does even bapto always mean to immerse? 7. What other meaning has it?

[baptontai,] but do not immerse their beards. The blood of a mouse colors, [ebapteto,] but it does not immerse a lake. Nebuchadnezzar, when he was driven from among men, and dwelt with the beasts of the field, was [ebaphe] wet, but not immersed, with the dews of heaven. Dan. 5: 21. Bapto, and its compounds, *em bapto*, occur five times in the New Testament. "Send Lazarus that he may dip [bapse, *immerse,*] the tip of his finger in water." Luke, 16: 24. "He to whom I shall give a sop when I have [bapsas] immersed it, and when he had dipped [em-bapsas, immersed] it he gave it to Judas." John, 13: 26. "He that dippeth [em-bapsas, immerseth] his *hand* with me in the dish." Math. 26: 23. [1]It is supremely foolish to adhere to immerse, as the sense of em-bapsas in this verse. [2]No one can believe that the hands of Jesus and Judas were absolutely immersed, at the same time, in the fluid used for moistening their bread! [3]And yet such is the absurdity involved in affirming that baptizo means *solely* to immerse: and on such an absurdity is based the claim for the *necessity* of immersion, in order to valid baptism. The other place where the word occurs, is where Jesus is represented as a mighty conquerer, returning as a victor, being "clothed in a vesture dipped [bebammenon, immersed] in blood." Rev. 19: 13. It is certain-

1. From its use in the New Testament, does it appear always to mean immerse? 2. Why? 3. What is said of baptizo?

ly saying a great deal with such a use of the word before us, to say *positively* that it always means immerse. The garments of warriors are not usually immersed in blood, but merely stained, or spattered with it.

We have shown that even *bapto* does not always mean to immerse. In the derivative *baptizo*, the idea of immersion is almost lost in the New Testament. As near as I have been able to determine, baptizo occurs in the New Testament [1] seventy-seven times. Baptism [baptisma] twenty-two times, baptisms [baptismos] four times, and [2] there is not *one* place where I would dare say that it means immersion, but many places where it clearly does not mean it. I had thought, when I commenced the investigation, to quote all the passages where these words are used, but the limits of this little work will not permit. I will quote enough to show that it does not *always* mean to immerse, if it ever does. [3] Nine times where *baptizo*, and three where *baptisma*, [baptism,] occur, reference is had to the sufferings of Christ. [4] "Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" says Christ to Zebedee's children. Math. 20: 22, 23. Mark, 10: 38, 39. Read it as some would have it translated: "Are ye able to be *immersed* in the immersion that I am immersed with!" [5] His meaning is,

1. How many times has it been found to occur in the New Testament? 2. Is it clear that it ever means immersion? 3. Does it ever refer to the sufferings of Christ? 4. In what passage? 5. What is the meaning of this passage?

are ye able to endure the sufferings that I am to endure. [1]For he then adds, "ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," i. e., ye shall, indeed, suffer with me. [2]One of them, John, was banished, and cast into a caldron of boiling oil, from which he miraculously escaped; the other, James, was beheaded. [3]They were baptized with his baptism—partook of his sufferings—but in no sense were they immersed with him. Again, [4]"I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished," Luke, 12: 50, i. e., [5]I have dreadful sufferings to undergo, and how am I distressed till the anguish is over. To translate it immerse destroys the meaning. "I have an immersion *to be* immersed with." None, who suppose that Jesus had been once immersed, suppose that he was to be immersed *again*, and yet this passage affirms it, if baptizo always means to immerse.

[6]In seventeen places, where baptizo occurs, it seems to denote a relation between water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as though one was a symbol of the other. As, [7]"I indeed baptize you *with* water, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Math. 3: 11. And again the same expression occurs, Mark, 1: 8, and

---

1. What reason to think that this is its meaning? 2. How did they suffer? 3. Were they baptized with his baptism? 4. In what other passage does baptism refer to the sufferings of Christ? 5. What its meaning? 6. In how many passages is baptism used to show the relation between water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Spirit? Mention some places.

Luke, 3: 16, and also John, 1: 25, 26, 33. Again, [7]"John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts, 1: 5. [7]"As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning, then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the *Holy Ghost*." Acts, 11: 16. [1]To translate baptizo to immerse, in these passages, will sufficiently show the absurdity of saying it *always* means to immerse. Take the first, "I indeed immerse you [2]*with* water, he shall immerse you *with* the Holy Ghost and *with* fire." If the expression, "*with* water," does not sound right, read it *in* water, but it must then read [3]"in the Holy Ghost and *in* fire," for [4]the preposition is *en*, in each case, and the construction precisely alike, if it be translated *in*, in one case, it must in the other. [5]Introduce *purify*, the meaning of baptizo as a religious rite, in the place of immerse, and the passage is clear and expressive. [6]"I indeed purify you with water, he shall *purify* you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

[7]The Jews partook of their food with their fingers, from this arose [8]the custom (which [9]the

1. How is the absurdity of saying that baptize always means immerse, shown? 2. Did John baptize with water, or in water? If we say with water, could they be immersed? 3. If we say in water, what else must we say? 4. Why? 5. What word expresses the meaning? 6. How would the passage then read? 7. Did the Jews use knives and forks? 8. What custom arose from this? 9. What did the Pharisees make of it?

Pharisees made a religious rite) of washing their hands before meals. "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (that is to say, with unwashen) hands, they found fault; for the Pharisees, and [1]all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash [baptontai, [2]baptize] they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as [3]the washing [baptismous, baptisms] of cups and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables," [klinon, couches.] Mark, 7: 2–4. The third verse here seems to explain the fourth; they washed their hands oft, as a religious rite, holding the tradition of the elders, and as a means of cleansing, and when they return from the market, for fear of having touched some unclean person, they wash, yet the original is baptize. [4]No one can suppose that all the Jews *immersed* themselves before every meal, or every time they came from the market. [5]They simply washed their hands, as is said in the third verse, "except they wash their hands oft, they eat not, holding the tradition of the elders." [6]The question of the Pharisees to Jesus, Math. 15: 2, shows that baptism here means washing. "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the el-

1. What was the custom of all of the Jews before meals and when they returned from the markets? 2. What is the original? 3. What else do they hold? 4. Is it reasonable to suppose that they immersed themselves so frequently? 5. What probably was their custom? 6. What does the question of the Pharisees show?

ders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread." And again when Jesus sat down to eat bread without the customary washing, [1]to rebuke the Jews for placing so much dependance on forms and ceremonies, the Pharisee, with whom he was invited to dine, [2]"marvelled [greatly wondered] [3]that he had not first washed [Greek ebaptisthe, [4]baptized] before dinner." Luke, 11: 38. Can it be possible that the Pharisee marvelled that Jesus did not go and plunge himself in water before dinner? Surely not. [5]His marvel was that Jesus paid so little respect to the tradition of the *elders*, as not to wash his hands before meals. And can it reasonably be supposed that the Jews *immersed* their cups, pots, brazen vessels and couches. Some of them might have been dipped in water when they were washed, and doubtless were, but certainly not all. Especially [6]it is not reasonable to suppose that they immersed the couches on which they reclined at meals, and the beds on which they slept, for the word *klinon* means every thing on which they lay. Some of these were many feet long and broad, sufficient for nine persons to recline upon at meals.

As we learn from John, 2: 6, provisions were made among the Jews for these various washings.

---

1. Why did Jesus sit down to meat without the customary washing? 2. What did the Pharisee do when he saw that Jesus disregarded the custom of washing the hands? 3. At what? 4. What is it in the Greek? 5. Did he marvel that Jesus did not immerse himself before dinner? 6. It is said that the Jews baptized their cups, pots, brazen vessels and tables or couches, did they immerse them?

[1]"And there were set six water-pots of stone, [earthen crocks,] after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece." And [2]the customary manner of washing the hands, was for a servant to pour the water upon them. "Here is Elisha, the son of Shaphat, which poured water upon the hands of Elijah." 2 Kings, 3: 11. Undoubtedly their purifications were performed in various ways. For Paul, speaking of the ordinances of the Jews, says, "Which stood only in meats and drinks and *divers* washings," [Greek *diaphorois baptismois*, [3]various baptisms,] and then he goes on to inform us how some of these *various baptisms* were performed, v. 13. [4]"For if the blood of bulls, and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, *sprinkling* the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more the blood of Christ," &c. "Moses . . . *sprinkled* both the book and all the people. Moreover, he *sprinkled* likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry." v. 19. We here see what Paul means by various baptisms—[5]*various ceremonial purifications.*

The children of Israel "were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." 1 Cor. 10: 2. Surely they were not plunged into the water, for

---

1. Were any provisions made in the houses of the Jews for their various washings? 2. How were the hands usually washed? 3. What does Paul call these various washings of the Jews? 4. How does he say some of them were performed? 5. What does he mean by various baptisms?

[1]Moses affirms that they "went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground," that "the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them." And the Psalmist, alluding to it, says, "Thou hast with thine arm redeemed thy people, the sons of Jacob and Joseph. The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afrad; the depths also were troubled: the clouds poured out water; the skies sent out a sound, . . . . thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron." Ps. 77: 15–20. [2]Here the passing of the cloud over the Israelites, and its pouring out water, are called baptism.

Sufficient quotations from scripture have been made, to show that the word used to denote baptism does not *always* mean to immerse, *nor even generally*. A few references to the writings of the early christians will show that [3]they did not use it generally in the sense to immerse, but as equivalent to purify, in a sacrificial sense.

[3]Origin speaks of the wood on which Elijah commanded the water to be poured, as *baptized*, and says that it "needed to be purified in order that it might be burned when the Lord should be revealed in fire." He uses baptism in the sense of purifying.

Tertullian speaks of *baptism* by *sprinkling*. Ma-

1. The children of Israel were said to be baptized in the cloud and in the sea, were they immersed? 2. How were they baptized? 3. How did the early christian fathers, who wrote in Greek and understood its meaning, the word baptizo?

ny of the Fathers understood the passage, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you," Ezek. 36: 25, [1]as referring to baptism. [2]Jerome, speaking of it, represents God as saying: "For my name-sake I spared, sanctified, and restored them, so that upon those who believe and are converted from error, I might *pour out the clean water of baptism*, and *cleanse* them from all their abominations." He speaks of baptism, by *pouring out water*, as cleansing. [3]They do speak of baptism by immersion, but of the immersion [4]as *denoting purification*. [5]They speak of persons being baptized with the Holy Ghost as equivalent to being regenerated, or purified by the Holy Ghost. [6]They often speak of the baptism of tears—the baptism of blood—of fire, &c., i. e., being purified by tears—by shedding their blood—by being burned.

[7]From what has been said it is evident that the mode of performing baptism cannot be determined by baptizo. [8]And for any person to assert that "it means immersion and nothing else," is to say that the translators of the Bible were so ignorant that they did not know how the word should be translated; or that they were so unprincipled as not to translate it correctly, either of which position must

---

1. How did they understand the words "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, &c.?" 2. What does Jerome say of it? 3. Do they ever speak of baptism by immersion? 4. In what sense? 5. What kind of baptism do the fathers speak of? 6. What do they mean by the baptism of the Holy Spirit—of tears—of fire, blood, &c.? 7. Can we determine the mode of baptism by baptizo? 8. What is the influence of saying that it means only to immerse?

destroy our confidence in any part of the English Bible, and promote skepticism and infidelity!

III. The expressions, "baptized *in* Jordan," "went down *into* the water," "came up out of the water," &c., [1]do not determine any thing in reference to the mode.

When John was baptizing, "Jerusalem and all Judea, &c., were baptized of him [en] in Jordan." Math. 3: 6. That nothing can be determined by the Greek word [2]*en*, translated *in*, may be seen from the fact, that [3]it is translated in twenty different ways in the New Testament, as *at*, Acts, 7: 29; *among*, Luke, 7: 16; *by*, Math. 5: 34, 35; *with*, Luke, 14: 34; "wherewith," with what, "shall it be salted;" so in 1 Cor. 4: 21, "shall I come with [en] a rod?" How would it sound to say, "shall I come *in* a rod?" It is rendered *through*, Math. 9: 34. [4]It is translated *at* one hundred times, and [5]a hundred and fifty times *with*. [6]It may be translated in the present case, "*at* Jordan," "*by* Jordan," or "*with* Jordan," with perfect propriety. I prefer to say, "Jerusalem and all Judea, &c., were baptized of him *at* Jordan.

"Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway *out of* [Greek, [7]*apo*] the water." Math. 3: 16. [8]The common meaning of *apo*, is from, and [9]thus it

1. Can we determine the mode of baptism, by the expression, "went down into," "came up ont of," &c.? 2. What is the Greek word for in? 3. Does it always mean the same thing? 4. Is it ever translated at? 5. Ever with? 6. What may it be translated here? 7. What is the Greek word rendered "out of?" 8. What the general meaning of "apo?" 9 How does this appear?

is rendered in two hundred and thirty-five instances in the first five books of the New Testament, whilst it is rendered *out of* in only forty-two instances within the same limits.

The following passages show the absurdity of rendering it *out of:* [1]"Come down from [apo] the cross." Math. 27: 40. How would it sound to say, "come down *out of* the cross." [1]"The veil of the temple was rent in two [apo] from the top to the bottom." v. 51. [1]"He is risen from [apo] the dead. Ch. 28: 7. [1]"From [apo] the least to the greatest." Acts, 8: 10. [1]"Returned from [apo] the sepulchre." Luke, 24: 9, &c. With this rendering the passage reads: [2]"Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway *from* the water."

In the case of the Eunuch, Acts, 8:, it is said, "they both went down into [Greek, [3]eis] the water;" but this expression throws no light on the mode. [4]*Eis* is rendered *to* very frequently. [5]In the first five books of the New Testament it is rendered *to* one hundred and eighty-eight times, and in this chapter it is rendered *to*, and *unto*, six times, and *into* but once. It is the same expression that a Greek would use, were he to speak of going to a spring to quench his thirst. The priests stood still *in* Jordon, when only on the bank. Josh. 3: 8.

---

1. What expressions show the absurity of saying it must mean "out of?" 2. How should this passage be rendered? 3. In the baptism of the Eunuch, what is the Greek word rendered "into?" 4. Why does not this decide that they were immersed? 5. How many times is it rendered "to" in the Gospels and Acts?

Peter was commanded, [1]"Go thou to"—[eis not *into*]—"the sea and cast a hook," &c. Math. 17: 27. [1]"As they were afraid and bowed down their faces to"—[eis not into]—"the earth." Luke, 24: 5. [1]"The other disciple did outrun Peter and came first to [eis] the sepulchre, yet went he not in." John, 20: 4, 5. "Philip was found at [eis] Azotus." Acts, 8: 40. "The Son of man is betrayed to [eis] be crucified." Math. 26: 2. It is useless to multiply references. Christ went [eis] into a mountain, as well as into the water." The Israelites went down into Egypt, as well as came *up out of* Egypt. The construction is precisely similar, where Peter went [*eis*] to the sepulchre, yet entered not, and where the Eunuch and Philip went down [eis] into the water, and should be rendered alike. Then it would read, [2]"They went down [i. e. from the chariot] *to* the water, and he baptized him." Acts, 8: 38.

"And when they were come up out of [ek] the water." v. 19. No more can be determined from the use of [3]*ek*, than from the other words I have examined. The preposition *ek*, simply signifies motion from a place; as "ek *Tiberiados*," from Tiberias; "ek *Aiguptou*," from Egypt; "ek *ton ouranon*," from heaven. Math. 3: 17. These are ex-

1. What expressions show the absurdity of saying it must mean "into?" 2. How should it be rendered here? 3. What is the Greek word in this case rendered "out of?"

pressions, and should be translated alike, "If I be lifted up from [*ek*] the earth." John, 12: 32. "They came up from [*ek*] the water." Acts, 8: 39. [1]It is rendered *from* in one hundred and two instances in the first five books of the New Testament, and *out of* but seventy-seven times within the same limits. The passage itself is enough to show that *eis* does not mean into; for "they went down *both* [eis] into the water;"—if eis means into, or under, as some would have us think, [2]then *both* were *under* water, and being both *under*, "he baptized him!"

IV. The cases of baptism recorded in the scripture, do not favor the idea that immersion is essential.

[3]It cannot be proved that John practiced immersion. The circumstances are against it. [4]1st. John is always said to baptize *with* water—not in it—whether at Jordan, in Enon, or in the wilderness. [4]2d. The multitudes baptized by him precludes the idea of immersion. "All Judea, and all Jerusalem, and all the region round about Jordan," were baptized of him. This country, it is computed, contained over two millions of people. If but one in ten had come to John's baptism, it had taken him, baptizing eight hours a day, at the rate of thirty an hour, nearly two years and a half! and yet John

---

1. What is the meaning of "ek?" 2. Suppose we render "eis" into, or under, what follows? 3. Can it be proved that John baptized by immersion? 4. What arguments against it?

was in the ministry less than two years. Besides, no man could perform such an amount of labor.

It may be asked why he baptized at Jordan, and in Enon, because there was much water, if it was not for the purpose of immersion? [1]All historians and travellers agree in saying that the country, where John baptized, was but poorly watered. [2]"The whole plain," says Josephus, "is *destitute of water*, except the Jordan." Says a recent traveller, [3]"We *replenished our water-bottles*, as we were warned that we should find no more till afternoon. . . . [3]The plain was *one entire* desert, during the whole day's ride of twenty-five miles." If such immense crowds came to John's baptism, it would be very necessary for him to select a spot well watered, for the comfort and accommodation of the multitude and their camels. No great gathering would be appointed fifteen or twenty miles from a spring, well, or stream of water. Hence John baptized at Jordan, and in "Enon, because there was much water," [polla hudata,] [4]*many waters, springs*, or *streams of water*—not for the purpose of immersion, so far as any evidence is furnished to us.

The word translated baptize, the expressions, "into," and "out of," and his being in Enon, or at Jordan, furnish us no proof that he immersed,

---

1. If John did not immerse, why did he resort to Jordan and Enon? 2. What does Josephus say of the region where John baptized? 3. What is said by a modern American traveller? 4. What does the expression, "much water," mean?

whilst the vast multitudes he baptized, the brief period of his ministry, and the fact stated that [1]he baptized *with*, not *in*, water, [2]Math. 3: 11; [2]Mark, 1: 8; [2]Luke, 3: 16; [2]John, 1: 26, 31, 33, convince us that he did not immerse. Another thing; the discussion between John's disciples and the Jews, about purifying, on the ground where John was baptizing, (John, 3: 25,) seems to show that his baptism was of the nature of purifying, and this we know was performed in various ways, as Paul speaks of various baptisms, though more generally by *sprinkling* or pouring. [3]The probability is that John stood near the brink of the river and sprinkled, or poured, the water upon those whom he baptized.

But [4]whatever mode was practiced by John, his baptism is not binding upon us, because it was not *christian* baptism. 1st. [5]It is called *John's* baptism, in distinction from christian baptism. 2d. John baptized simply unto repentance. 3d. He baptized *preparatory* to the christian dispensation. Those baptized were to believe in him who was to come. The command to him was, "Prepare ye the Lord." His baptism *began and ended before christian baptism was instituted*—before the Savior conferred upon ministers the authority to baptize, as recorded in Math. 28: 20. 4. John did not baptize in the name of the Trinity, as christian baptism

---

1. Did John baptize in water? 2. Proof. 3. How did John probably baptize? 4. Was John's baptism christian baptism? 5. What evidence of this? Repeat the heads.

must be performed. 5. Those baptized by John were re-baptized by the apostles, Acts, 19: 1–12, 2: 41, and 21: 20, plainly showing that they did not regard it as christian baptism; hence,

[1] *The baptism of our Savior*, however performed, is *no example for us*. It was not christian baptism. [2] 1st. He was not baptized unto repentance, as he had no sins to repent of. 2d. He was not baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, as we must be. 3. He was not required to believe on Him who was to come—to exercise *faith*—for he could not be required to believe in himself. 4. He was not baptized until he was thirty years old, and could not be *our example* in this respect. Nor was he in reference to the place where he was baptized—Jordan. We are not required to go there to be baptized by *John*. [3] In many things Christ could not be *our example*. He was *circumcised* when eight days old, Luke, 2: 22; he kept the *Passover*; observed the *seventh* day as sabbath, and complied with all the rites of the Mosaic law. These were *divine institutions*, yet we are not in these to take *Christ as our example*. He fasted forty days—drove out the buyers and sellers from the temple with a whip—wrought many miracles which we are not expected to do. But we have no evidence to believe that Jesus was

---

1. Is the baptism of our Savior an example for us, or was it christian baptism? 2. Why not? Repeat the heads. 3. Mention some other things where we are not to follow his example?

immersed, but much to the contrary. The word baptize, and the expressions, "*into*" and "*out of*," gives us no light upon the mode. He was baptized, as he [1]informs us, "to fulfill all righteousness." Math. 3: 16. As he was now about [2]to be *visibly inducted into his official work*, as the Messiah—[3]"a high priest over the house of God," Heb. 10: 21, he must enter upon the work in a regular manner. [4]"No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is *called of God, as was Aaron.*" Rom. 5: 4. Christ, then, was thus called. [5]Aaron was inducted into his office by the rite of washing, or baptism, [6]"And Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them *with* water." Lev. 8: 6. [7]This washing, or purification, was performed on the Levites by sprinkling. [8]"Thus shalt thou do to cleanse them: *sprinkle* the water of purifying upon them." Num. 8: 7. Our Savior, born under the law, and being a priest, having arrived at the age of [9]thirty, when priests generally were inducted into office, came to John, a prophet, acknowledged to be from God, [10]to be set apart, by having the water of purification sprinkled upon him. John, knowing his dignity, and to give him the precedence in the eyes of the multitude, forbade him, saying, "I have need to be baptized [purified] of thee."

---

1. Why was Jesus baptized? 2. What was he about to do? 3. Was Jesus a high priest? 4. How was he appointed? 5. How was Aaron inducted into the priestly office? 6. Proof. 7. How were the Levites set apart? 8. Proof. 9. At what age were priests inducted into their office? 10. Why did he come to John?

Then says the Savior, [1]"Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness;" i. e. [2]thus as priests are inducted into office by sprinkling the water of purifying upon them, so must I be, before I can enter upon my ministry. Then he baptized him. The argument, to my mind, is conclusive against his immersion. (For the meaning of the expression, "down into," "up out of," see p. 255.)

[3]There are ten cases of christian baptism mentioned in the scripture. The first is that of the three thousand who were baptized, in Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost. [4]The probabilities are all against their being baptized by immersion. [5]There was not sufficient time to do it. Peter began his sermon at the third hour of the day—or nine o'clock. We cannot suppose that he, and the other apostles, concluded their speaking, giving instruction, &c., before noon. If the eleven disciples had all baptized, and at the rate of thirty each per hour, it had taken them nine hours to have baptized the three thousand, and there is no evidence that any others assisted. Other circumstances still, render it more improbable that they were immersed. 1st. [6]They were in the midst of a crowded and populous city. More than a million of strangers were present at the

1. What did the Savior say when John forbade him? 2. What did he mean by this? What do you say about his going down into the water and coming up out of it? Into, means, *to*, and out of, *from*. 3. How many cases of christian baptism are recorded? 4. Were the three thousand immersed in less than a half a day in Jerusalem? 5. What is the first thing that renders it improbable? 6 Mention some other things that show it improbable? Heads.

Passover, and no intimation is made of their leaving the place where Peter preached, to be baptized. 2d. It was at the dry season of the year—Pentecost being about the last of March—when water was exceedingly scarce in the city; the brook Kidron, the only stream that watered it, was dry. It is doubtful whether convenience could be had for immersing such a company of strangers. 3d. Baths, at best, were scarce in Jerusalem, and the few there, belonged to the rich, who would be unlikely to open them to such an excited multitude, on so short a notice. 4. They were in a city where, in the greatest tumult, the principal men in it had united, only fifty days before, in putting to death the originator of this new sect, and consequently they would be very slow to open their baths to his disciples. 5. The persons baptized were unprepared to be immersed, having no garments ready except those they had on. These circumstances all combined, render it improbable in the highest degree, that the three thousand were immersed.

There are four cases of baptism recorded in Acts, 8: 12 and 13, 18: 8, and 19: 5, which throw no light on the mode. I will notice the case of the Eunuch, Acts, 8: 26–39. The circumstances must be noted. Philip was journeying from Jerusalem to Gaza, [1] "*which is desert.*" v. 26. [2] He found the

---

1. What is the character of the country in which Philip was journeying when he came across the Eunuch? 2. Where was the Eunuch reading?

Eunuch reading that portion of Isaiah (which was not then divided into chapters) which treats of the Messiah. Here is the beginning of the passage: [1]"Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled very high. As many were astonished at thee; (his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men;) so shall he *sprinkle* many nations, . . . . he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth," &c. Isai. 52: 13, 14. He had just read of Christ, [2]"So shall he *sprinkle* many nations," and lo, water appears in the *desert!*" [3]"See, water," [the words, "*here is*," are supplied,] exclaimed the delighted Eunuch, "what doth hinder me to be baptized." This surely does not look like immersion. (See the expression went down "into," and came up "out of," explained, p. 255.)

[4]Paul was baptized in the house of Judas, exhausted by three days abstinence from food. Acts, 9: 18. [5]There is no evidence of his leaving his sick room. The record is, [6]he "arose, [from his couch,] and was baptized, and when he had received meat, he was strengthened." If immersion had been the mode, it would seem natural that he should have received nourishment, feeble as he was, before he went away to the stream for baptism. [7]The

1. How does it read? 2. What had he just been reading? 3. What does he say as he discovers water in the desert? 4. Where was Paul baptized? 5. Did he leave his sick room for that purpose? 6. What is the record? 7. How was he baptized?

probability is that he was baptized sitting upon the couch on which he lay, or standing upon his feet.

In the baptism of Cornelius and his family, Acts, 10: 47, [1]Peter, after they had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, by its falling upon them, inquires for water in such a manner as seems to preclude the idea of immersion. "Can any man forbid water?" an unnatural expression if they were to go away for immersion, but a very proper one if water was to be brought to them.

Paul, on the sabbath day, went down to a proseuchæ, or house of prayer, (common among the Jews,) situated on the bank of a river in a retired spot, to preach to the women who resorted there. Acts, 16: 13. Lydia was here converted, and was baptized, and her household. [2]No evidence, of course, is furnished for her immersion, because the women resorted here to pray, and were not here for the purpose of baptism. Paul went there because they resorted there, not to baptize.

The jailor, Acts, 16: 25, was converted and baptized at midnight, in a prison. The circumstances will show that baptism, by immersion, was very improbable. Paul and Silas having been beaten with many stripes, were thrust into the inner prison, and their feet made fast in the stocks. At midnight they prayed and sang praises to God,—the massy

1. Would Peter have been likely to have said, "Can any man forbid water," if Cornelius had been immersed? 2. Why was Paul beside the river when Lydia and her household were baptized, if not for immersion?

gates of the prison were opened, and their bands were loosed. The keeper, supposing they had escaped, drew his sword and was about to kill himself, when Paul cried out, "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here." He immediately asked the momentous question, "*What must I do to be saved?*" believed in Christ, and was baptized that *same hour,* [1]in the prison. There is the clearest evidence that they did not go out of the prison, for when it was day they were still in the prison, and "the magistrates sent the sergeants, saying, "Let those men go; and the keeper of the prison told this saying to Paul, . . . therefore depart, and go in peace." [2]But Paul would not go out *with* leave from the magistrates; would he, then, go out *without* leave? The thing is incredible. [3]"They have beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans," said Paul, "and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." When it is said, v. 34, "he brought them into his house," [4]it was merely bringing them into the apartment, in the same building, reserved for the family of the jailor, who would not, for his life, have dared to let Paul go out of the prison without authority.

There are some passages which, when quoted

---

1. Where was the jailor baptized? 2. Might Paul not have taken him out of the prison and baptized him? 3. What did Paul say? 4. What is meant when it is said "he brought them into his house?"

without reference to the ideas in the connexion, seem to favor immersion.

[1]The expression "buried with him by baptism into death," Rom. 6: 4, has no reference to the mode of baptism, but to the believers being dead unto sin. [2]The burial of Christ showed that he was actually dead, and separated from the world around him. [3]So the baptism of the christian is the outward sign of a death unto sin, a separation from the world—its pleasures and lusts. Says the venerable and pious Judson, missionary to India, [4]"The apostle is here speaking of *spiritual circumcision* and *spiritual* baptism." We are baptized *into Jesus Christ*. It is not water baptism, but spiritual baptism—faith that does this. Various figures are used to denote. Believers, who have renounced their sinful ways, and made profession of Christ by baptism, are said to be [5]"*baptized into his death*," v. 3, [5]"to be buried with him *by baptism into death*," v. 4, [5]"to be planted in the likeness of his death," v. 5, [5]"to be *crucified with him*," v. 6, [5]"to be dead unto sin," v. 11, [5]"let not sin, therefore," says the apostle, "reign in your mortal bodies." v. 12. These expressions all refer to the same thing—being dead to sin and it pursuits, even as Christ was dead when he was laid in the grave.

---

1, Does not the expression, "buried with him by baptism," prove immersion to be the mode of baptism? 2. What did the burial of Christ show? 3. What does the believer's baptism? 4. What does Dr. Judson say of this passage? 5. What other expressions are used to show the believer's death to sin?

"Being planted with Christ," "crucified with Christ," are never taken in any other than a spiritual sense, and [1]there is no consistency in taking the expression, "buried with him by baptism," in any other than a spiritual sense, as it stands in the same connexion, and is designed to illustrate the same thing. The passage in Col. 2: 12, even more clearly refers to spiritual circumcision—being dead to sin, and raised to newness of life—than the one which we have explained. The passage in 1 Pet. 3: 21, does not favor immersion. Noah floated above the water and was *saved*, whilst the water was poured, or sprinkled, upon the ark. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also *save us*, ([2]not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the *answer of a good conscience* toward God.")

V. [3]The history of the church does not prove that it is *necessary* to *dip* the person in water in order to valid baptism.

Though immersion was very early practiced in the churches, yet it can easily be proved by church history that it was not regarded as *essential*. Baptism was performed in various ways. Pond gives an account of a Jew who, being sick, was baptized, not having water, by sprinkling sand upon him

1. As these expressions all refer to the same thing, is it consistent to make one refer to baptism and not the rest, or to take some literally and some spiritually? 2. What is baptism said to be? 3. What is shown by a history of the church?

three times. "He recovered. His case was reported to the bishop, who decided that the man was baptized, if he only had water poured on him again." Laurintus, "a little while before he suffered, baptized one of his executioners with a *pitcher of water*." Jerome speaks of a mode of baptism, by "*thrice dipping of the head*." Augustine mentions the same, according to Pond. Clodovicus, king of the Franks, was baptized by Remigius, 499, A. D., by pouring water upon him. Gennardius, 490, A. D., says: "The person to be baptized is either wetted with water, or plunged into it." The emperor Constantine was baptized by Euselius, 337, A. D., as he lay sick in his bed, clothed in white. Cyprian, the martyr, 150, A. D., speaking of some who had been baptized by sprinkling, quotes the prophecy in Ezekiel, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean," and then adds, "hence it appears that sprinkling is of equal validity with the salutary bath." "Novitian, being visited by sickness, was baptized in the bed on which he lay, by pouring water upon him," only one hundred and twenty years after the apostles. Clemens, of Alexandria, only fifty years after the apostles, speaks of a backslider who was baptized the second time with tears." These few extracts from history, from the many that might be furnished, shows that immersion was not regarded *essential* by the early christians.

It is a matter of history that no sect, or denomination, ever held that immersion was *essential*, till the rise of the Ana-Baptists, in the sixteenth century.

So much has been said, simply to show that immersion is not *essential* to baptism, not to prove that it has not been practiced by the church from a very early period—sprinkling and pouring have likewise been practiced. We are willing on this point to have all satisfy their own consciences, and greatly regret that a point, non-essential to salvation, or to the usefulness of christians, should occasion so much discussion, still we are not willing to have that *bound* which Christ has left free. Had the mode been *essential*, it had been revealed. Christ's yoke is easy and his burden light, yet immersion is not an easy yoke to the *sick* and *infirm*. It is said "the greater the cross the greater the crown." True, but not where the cross is of our own forming. "He delights not in sacrifice," said the Psalmist, "else would I give it. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Ps. 51: 16, 17. To all who make crosses for the glory of bearing them, the Lord may well say, "who hath required this at your hand.

### INFANT BAPTISM.

"Not only those that do actually profess faith in

and obedience unto Christ, but also [1]the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized." This belief of the body of christians is based,

I. [2]On the identity of the church of God in every age. Previous to the time of Abraham, it existed in an invisible state. [3]With Abraham the covenant was formed and the church *visibly* organized. "When Abraham was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared unto Abraham and said unto him, . . . . I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and *thy seed after thee*, in their generations, for an *everlasting covenant;* to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. . . . [4]This is my covenant [i. e. the *sign*, or *seal* of it] which ye shall keep between me and thee, and thy seed after thee; every man-child among you shall be circumcised. . . . He that is [5]eight days old shall be circumcised, . . . he that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised, . . . and the uncircumcised man-child shall be cut off from his people; *he* hath broken my covenant." Gen. 17: 1: 14. That this was the same covenant as that made with the church and christians of the present day, and hence embraced more than temporal blessings, is evident from the reasoning of Paul to the Romans. [6]"And he

1. Who are proper subjects for baptism? 2. What is the first argument for it? 3. With whom was the covenant made and the church visibly organized? 4. What was the sign or seal of this covenant? 5. At what age must the child be circumcised? 6. Was not circumcision merely a national badge?

[Abraham] received the sign of circumcision, a *seal* of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the *father of all them that believe,* . . . for the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through *the righteousness of faith,* . . . as it is written I have made thee a father of many nations. . . [1]Now it was not written for his sake alone, . . . but for *us also,* . . . *if we believe on him who raised up Jesus from the dead.*" Rom. 4: 11–24. [2]Paul labors to convince the Romans that they were as much interested in the covenant made with Abraham as were the Jews, and that [3]it was of a *spiritual* nature. "Know ye not, therefore, that *they which are of faith,* the same are the *children* of Abraham; and the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed . . . now to Abraham and *his seed* were the promises made. . . . And this, I say, that the *covenant* that was confirmed before, of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, *cannot disannul,* that it should make the promise of none effect. . . . [4]If ye, then, *be Christ's, then* are ye *Abraham's seed, and heirs* according to

1. Have we any interest with the covenant made with Abraham? 2. What does Paul endeavor to do? 3. Was the covenant of a temporal or spiritual nature? 4. What proof that we are interested in the covenant with Abraham?

the promise." Gal. 2: 7–29. No human argument could be as conclusive as this to show that the covenant made with Abraham is the covenant of grace made between God and every redeemed sinner, and that, though the Jewish polity—the ceremonial law—has passed, the *covenant is everlasting.* [1]The terms of it were precisely similar. God required [2]*faith and obedience* of Abraham; he requires it of us. [3]The temporal blessings promised to Abraham, were merely types of spiritual blessings. Abraham, and all who were saved previous to the advent of the Messiah, believed in a Savior to come, and trusted to his atoning merits as truly as do those who now believe in him as come. [4]"All these," said the apostle, speaking of the Old Testament saints, "died in faith, . . . and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth, for they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country . . . THAT IS A HEAVENLY." Heb. 11: 13–16. [5]Christians now feed by faith on Christ. And Paul says "that all our fathers [who were saved] did all eat of the same spiritual meat, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." 1 Cor. 10: 1–4. Stephen traces up the history of the church, and re-

1. Were the terms of the covenant made with Abraham and the covenant with sinners alike? 2. What are these terms? 3. Of what were the temporal blessings received of Abraham, types? 4. What was characteristic of Old Testament saints? 5. What resemblance between Christians now and formerly?

cognizes its existence in the days of Moses, and calls it [1]"the church in the wilderness." Acts, 7: 38. [2]The prophets are often enraptured at the glorious prospect of the church in the latter day, but never speak of the organization of a new church. Thus the Gentiles are represented as being brought in, and the sons of strangers eagerly engaged in building up the walls of [3]the church then in existence, not the walls of a new church. Isai. 65: 10. "Say ye to the daughter of Zion, [the church,] behold, thy salvation cometh." The apostles taught the same thing following the example of Christ, their leader. [4]Christ preached and labored in the synagogue and in the temple, so did the apostles. On the day of Pentecost three thousand were *added to the church*—[5]*the Jewish church*—the same with which Christ and his apostles had been connected. [6]We read of no new church organization, only a more spiritual and simple worship was introduced. [7]Before they were added by faith in a Messiah to come, now in him as come, and as having greatly purified his beloved Zion—the praise of the whole earth. Says Paul, "Blindness, *in part*, is happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles become *in*"—into the church of which the Jews were

1. What does Stephen call the body of Christians in the days of Moses? 2 Do the prophets speak of a new church organization? 3. Into what church are the Gentiles represented as being brought? 4. Did the apostles separate themselves from the Jewish church? 5. To what church were the three thousand added? 6. Have we any record of the formation of a new church? 7, What difference in joining the church before or after the crucifixion?

members. [1] "Wherefore, remember that ye, being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by the . . . circumcision, [i. e. the Jews.] That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the *commonwealth of Israel*, and strangers from the COVENANT of PROMISE, having no hope, and without God in the world; but now in Christ, ye, who sometimes [for a long time] were far off, *are made nigh* by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made BOTH ONE, [both Jew and Gentile one church,] . . . that he might reconcile both *into one body*. . . . Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens [heirs to the same church privileges] with the saints, and of the household of God," [the Jews.] Eph. 2: 11–19.

One more quotation shall suffice on this point. Paul, addressing the Gentiles, refers to the original purity of the church, and draws this argument: [1] "If the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches." Pure religion dwells in the church. "AND if some of the branches [the Jews] be broken off, and thou [the Gentiles] being a wild olive tree, wert grafted *in among them*, [upon the church then existing among the Jews,] and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, [of all of their church privileges,] boast not thyself against the branches, . . .

1. What proof that the Gentiles were added to the purified Jewish Church?

thou bearest not the root, [the Jewish church,] but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off, that I might be graffed *in*. Well: because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear. . . . And they, also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed in; for God is able to *graff them in again*." Evidently into the same church from which, by unbelief, they had been broken off. "For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature, into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, [the Jews,] which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive tree, [church privileges.] For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, . . . that blindness, in part, is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in." Rom. 11: 16–25. Remark on these passages is needless. They clearly show that the church, before the coming of Christ, even in the days of Abraham, and since, is the same. [1]The covenant made with Abraham was the covenant of grace—that under which we live. [2]The church of God, then, is one in every age.

II. [3]Children were regarded as members of the church for many ages, and cannot be excluded without an express command, which we have not.

---

1. What was the covenant made with Abraham? 2. Is the church of God one, or more? 3. Were children ever considered members of the church?

[1]In the days of Abraham, and previous to the introduction of a more simple and purer system of worship, the sign of membership was circumcision, "he that is eight days old shall be circumcised, and the uncircumcised man-child shall be cut off from his people." Gen. 17: 14. [2]"I will establish my covenant," says God, "for an EVERLASTING COVENANT; to be a GOD to thee and *to thy seed after thee.*" And of this, circumcision was the sign. [3]"If ye, then, be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," heirs to the same church privileges as Abraham's seed, and to the same eternal inheritance, [4]The seal of this covenant is *not* everlasting. It may be varied as often as God sees fit, and yet the covenant remain the same. This sign of the covenant was to them a "seal of the righteousness of faith." Rom. 4: 11. [5]It denoted circumcision of the heart—regeneration by the Spirit. [6]Baptism denotes the same thing; and when bloody rites ceased, was introduced as a part of a more simple and purer system. "Go ye, . . . teach, . . . *baptizing,*" is now the command, instead of "Go, teach, *circumcising.*" Were the latter the command now, no doubts would be entertained as to the subjects to be circumcised, nor should there be any doubts when the command

1. What was the sign of membership anciently? 2. How long was the covenant with Abraham and his seed to last? 3. Who are the seed of Abraham? 4. The covenant is everlasting, is the seal of it everlasting?—5. What did circumcision denote? 6. What does beptism?

is, "go, baptize." [1]Children were members when the command was, "circumcise," and circumcision was the sign of it; why should they not be members when the command is "baptize," and their baptism a sign of membership. [2]They were circumcised, as well as baptized, upon the faith of their parents, and the minister of Christ has no more authority to exclude them in the one case than in the other. Says Peter, on the day of Pentecost, when three thousand were added to the church, "Repent and be baptized, . . . for [3]the promise is unto you and to *your children*." Acts, 2: 38, 39. Peter had no thought of excluding children from the privilege of being in covenant with a covenant keeping God. If, then, they were once members, they are members still. Members of the church [4]in the same sense that miners are citizens of the United States.

III. [5]The privilege of membership was not to be less, but *greater*, under the christian dispensation than under the Old Testament economy. This need not be proved. It was the privilege of parents, under the Old Testament economy, [6]to bring their

---

1. If children were members when circumcision was the seal of the covenant, should they not be when baptism is the seal? 2. How were children circumcised? How are they baptised? 3. What does Peter say when three thousand were joining the church? 4. In what sense are baptized children members of the church? 5. Was the priviliges of membership to be less or greater under the new dispensation? 6. What was the privilege of parents under the old dispensation? May we not reasonably expect the same privilege now?

children into a covenant relation to God, and have the seal of this relation visibly fixed upon them. It was a privilege prized by the Jews more than any other one peculiarity of their religion, they clung to it with all the tenacity of parental affection. It was a pledge of God's protection, if they were in heart what the sign signified—circumcised. It was a witness which they could not forget that they were devoted to the Lord, and could not fail of heaven, unless they sold their birthright. Thus, in its design, religion was to be perpetuated, children were to receive the badge of membership, and to be educated for heaven—none were to apostatize. Proselytes added to the church, were to have the badge of membership fixed upon them, and upon their offspring, and thus the church was to enlarge till it filled the whole earth. This made Peter, when the three thousand were added, say, as if this would be the greatest conceivable privilege, "THE PROMISE IS TO YOU AND YOUR CHILDREN," even as it ever has been. Paul sets the matter at rest. "If some of the branches be broken off, &c., and thou wert graffed *in among* them, *and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree*"—of *all* the privileges and blessings of the Abrahamic church, one of the greatest of which is, the privilege of bringing your children into a covenant relation with God, and of having the seal of it affixed,—*circumcision* once, under the old dispensation, but the

milder and bloodless rite of [1]baptism, answering the same purposes as a sign and seal, under the new dispensation. And as the new dispensation is fuller than the old, so the sign is capable of a fuller application—to male and female. [2]Circumcision and the Passover were the sacraments of the Jewish church. [3]Baptism and the Lord's Supper the sacraments in the christian church. The Passover and the Lord's Supper have the same meaning, only one was typical, the other is commemorative. Circumcision signified native depravity, and the putting away of the filth of the flesh—regeneration—so does baptism. As an appendage to the Paschal supper, the Jews, in the time of our Lord, partook, as we are told, of a piece of bread and a cup of wine. [4]In the circumcision of prosolytes, it was also customary to add washing with water, or baptism, in token of their putting off the filthiness of heathenism. [5]Our Lord simply rejected the bloody parts of these rites and substituted [6]the unbloody, as they were in common use, as the shedding of blood was no longer necessary. The early christian Fathers all regarded baptism as coming in the place of circumcision. If, then, the privilege of membership was not to be less, but greater, under the gospel, the children of believers are still members. So the

---

1. What rite answers the same purpose now that circumcision did under the old dispensation? 2. What were the sacrements in the Jewish church? 3. What are in the christian? 4. What was the practice of the Jews in making prosolytes? 5. What did our Lord reject? 6. What retain?

Savior regarded them. [1]"He took them up in his arms and blessed them," and said "of such is the kingdom of heaven," i. e. such are members of the visible church. "The promise is to you and to your children." When the Jews shall be brought in, Jeremiah in prophecy affirms, [2]"their *children*, also, shall be as aforetime, and their congregations established before me." Jer. 30: 20. The practice of the apostles corresponded to these views. [2]Lydia only is mentioned as believing, whilst she and her *household* were baptized. Acts, 16: 15. [3]Abraham only believed, but all his household were circumcised, even to his servants. [3]The jailor *believed*. (The original for believe is in the singular number, showing that there is no evidence that any others of the family *believed*.) Scott translates it, "He [the jailor] rejoiced through all his house, having believed in God." Acts, 16: 34. [3]The household of Stephanes was also baptized. 1 Cor. 16: 15. Paul says, "the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the wife, &c., by the husband; else were your children unclean, [unfit, federally, to be members of the church,] but now are they holy," [federally, not personally.] As one of the parents believes the children are within the limits of the covenant—are members of the church general with their parents, and entitled to the seal

1. What did the Savior do? 2. What does Jeremiah say of the privilege of Gentile children? 3. Are any cases of household baptism recorded?

of their relation, baptism. [1]Faith is no more a *pre-requisite* to the *baptism* than it is to the *salvation* of the infant. If it can be saved without faith, it can be baptized without faith.

IV. Carrying out these views, the mass of the church, from the days of the apostles, have practiced infant baptism, regarding it as having come in the place of circumcision. [2]There is no ancient writer that does not speak of it as the practice of the apostles. According to the accurate Dr. Wall, [3]it was not even denied by any for one thousand one hundred years after Christ. *Justin Martyr*, born about forty years after the death of John, says, [4]"Many persons of both sexes, some sixty, some seventy years old, were made disciples from *childhood*" [ek paidon,] by infant consecration. *Irenius*, a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the apostle John, says, [5]"Christ came to save all persons by himself; all I say, who by him are *regenerated* [baptized] unto God; *infants*, and little ones, and youths, and elder persons." He uses the sign and the thing signified interchangeably. Tertullian, born about forty-five years after the death of John, advised the delay of infant baptism, on the ground that as he thought sin, *after* baptism, could not be forgiven. And yet his testimony is proof of its being in common use. [6]*Origin*, born eighty-five years after the

1. Is faith necessary to the baptism of infants? 2. Do we have any evidence from history that the early christians practised infant baptism? 3. What does Dr. Wall say? 4. Justyn Martyr? 5. Irenius? When did they live? 6. What says Origin, ninety-five years after the death of John?

death of John, says, "*Infants are baptized* for the forgiveness of sins." And again, [6] "According to the usage of the church, baptism is given even to infants." This he says to prove original sin. [6] Again, "Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins." And, "The church received an order from the apostles, to give baptism to infants." Origin must have known what his father believed, and his father must have been cotemporary with John. In the year 253, A. D., a council of sixty-six bishops met at Carthage. The following is the reply of the bishops to one who inquired if infants might be baptized before they were eight days old:

"Cyprian, and the rest of the Bishops who were present in the council, sixty-six in number, to Fidus, our brother, greeting:—As to the case of infants, *whereas you judge that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born, and that the rule of circumcision is* to be observed, that no one should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born. We were all in the council of a different opinion, . . . but we all rather judged that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to no human being that is born. . . [1] This, therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in council; that we ought not to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind to all. And this rule, as it holds for all, is,

1. What was the decision of sixty-six bishops in council, A. D. 253?

we think, more especially to be observed in reference to infants, even to those newly born." Optatus, A. D. 360, Gregory Nazianzen, 360, Ambrose, 374, Chrysostom, 380, all testify to the practice of infant baptism. St. Augustine testifies, A. D. 383, "that [1] the whole church practice of infant baptism." Pelagius, heretic as he was, says, [2] "Men *slander* me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants." [2] "*I never heard*," says he, and he had travelled nearly over the known world, "*of any*, not even the most impious heretic, WHO DENIED BAPTISM TO INFANTS." What adds still greater weight to the testimony of the fathers is, it was not given to prove infant baptism, but to prove original sin.

The first body of men, says Wall, the historian, that denied baptism to infants, were the Petrobrusians, A. D. 1150. Dr. Gill acknowledges that infant baptism was the practice of the church universally from the third to the eleventh century.

V. The adaptation of infant consecration [3] to perpetuate and extend the kingdom of Christ, is a strong argument in its favor. Spiritual blessings have, to a great extent, been conveyed [4] through the channel of the covenant. [5] If blessings come upon the offspring of parents who do not offer up their children in baptism, it is more than they have reason to expect. They have no *promise* for it.

1. What was the testimony of St. Augustine? 2. Of Pelagius? 3. Of what use is infant baptism? 4. In what channel have spiritual blessings been conveyed? 5. Are not others blessed who have not the seal of the covenant?

[1] *No promises are made to any out of the covenant.* Some out of it are blessed, even as the rain descends upon the evil and the good—the thankful and the unthankful, whilst [2] some within it, baptized and consecrated to God in infancy, sell their *birthright*, like Esau, and perish. Yet we do believe that [3] parents cannot too strongly plead the covenant, and that those consecrated to God in infancy will be *much more likely than others to be brought in* and saved. *God is a covenant-keeping God.* [4] Facts fully show that a very great majority of the ministers and officers of the church were baptized in infancy, and that the conversion of those who were baptized to those unbaptized in infancy, is as [5] two to one, and in many instances as three to one. Of sixty-nine added to this church, fifty were consecrated to God in infancy. Of one hundred in another church, seventy-five were baptized in infancy. This is about the proportion the country over, clearly showing the utility of obeying God—of *trusting to the covenant.* But God is faithful, even beyond the faithfulness of his people, and bestows the blessings of the covenant on multitudes who do not acknowledge the seal of it. When this is taken into the account, it will be seen that a *much* greater proportion of the really converted were the children of pious parents.

---

1. To whom are the promises made? 2. Are all who are baptized saved? 3. May parents plead the covenant in prayer for their children? 4. What do facts show? 5. Of converts generally, what proportion are baptized in infancy.

[1]Baptism is adapted to secure that through religious instruction for children on which the Bible so much insists. [2]The parent promises in the most solemn manner before God, angels and men, to train up the little one in the path of piety—to restrain it from sin and to educate it for heaven.

## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

As [3]baptism comes in the place of circumcision, so [4]the Lord's Supper comes in place of the Passover. It was instituted the night that Christ ate the last Passover with his disciples. [5]The Passover *typified* the atonement, the Lord's Supper *commemorates* it. The elements used are bread and wine. The bread broken and the wine poured, represent his body broken and his blood shed upon the cross for the sins of men. [6]We do not regard it as truly his body and blood, though he says "this is my body," but merely a representative, or symbol, of it. Corresponding expressions are found in the Bible. "The seven good kine are seven years," "the seven ill-favored kine are seven years." Gen. 41: 26, 27. The ten horns "are ten kings." Dan. 7: 24. Moses said of the Paschal lamb, "it is the Lord's Passover." Ex. 12: 11. It signifies it. And the Lord said, "this is my body," it *signifies*

---

1. What is baptism adapted to secure? 2. What does the parent promise? 3. What have we in the place of circumcision? 4. What in the place of the Passover? 5. What difference in the Passover and the Lord's Supper? 6. In the Lord's Supper do we partake of the real body and blood of Christ?

my body. It is called a sacrament, meaning an oath, because around the symbols of a Savior's broken body and shed blood, the christian swears allegiance to the King of kings. It is called the communion, as it is a sign of the fellowship of believers with one another, and with Christ. [1]Every individual of the race is bound to commemorate the sufferings and death of Christ. 1st. [1]Gratitude to him, who gave his life for sinners, demands it. 2d. Personal benefit prompts it. It strengthens faith, increases love, promotes holy desires, excites a hatred to sin, and assists in overcoming temptations, and binds together the hearts of christians. 3d. The honor and command of Christ, and the practice of the church in all ages require it.

*The qualifications for worthily partaking,* are, 1st. [2]To see something of the sinfulness of sin. 2d. To see our need of Christ as a Savior. 3d. Sincerity—to do it because Christ has commanded it—from a desire to keep him in remembrance. 4th. To feel our unworthiness. The really unworthy are apt to come in a very thoughtless manner. 5th. Renunciation of every known sin. It is awfully dangerous to come cherishing any known sin. 6th. Self-examination, (see page 170,) with meditation and much prayer. The "preparatory lecture" is designed to aid christians in this exercise,

1. Who should celebrate it? 2. Why? Repeat the heads. 3. What are the qualifications for worthily partaking? Repeat heads.

and every member of the church, unless *providentially detained*, should attend it. He who eats and drinks unworthily, exposes himself to the judgments of God. The posture to be observed is a matter of little consequence. Sitting is the most convenient attitude, and makes the least confusion. The Roman Catholics kneel in adoration of the element; though that posture is observed by some who are far from performing acts of idolatry. The time of the day is also as immaterial as is the mode in baptism.

It being the Lord's table, all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, in regular standing in any evangelical church, have a right to come around it. And there is nothing in scripture that allows us to forbid them.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

[1] Immortality of the Soul. — [1] Resurrection of the Body. — [1] General Judgment. — [1] Approval of the Righteous. — [1] Condemnation of the wicked.

[2] The soul is that which constitutes the real value of man. [3] It is an immediate creation of God. "God formeth the spirit." Zech. 12: 1. "He is the *Father* of spirits." Heb. 12: 9. Ultimately the spirit shall return [to be judged] to God who

1. What doctrines are contained in this article? 2. What gives to man his value? 3. Who made the soul?

gave it. It is not the product of matter in any refined combination. As one particle of matter is not mind and cannot think, neither is a mass of matter mind, nor can the mass think.

As to its nature. 1st. [1]It is a *real identity*, not a mere quality belonging to a body, as black, white, hard and soft are qualities of bodies. The soul is as distinct from the body, as the man and the house in which he lives. Destroy the house and the man survives. Destroy the body and the soul lives. Thus Paul speaks, "*We* are willing rather to be absent *from* the body." The soul is called "the man," the "inner man." Passions, qualities and habits belong to the soul, which could not be if the soul were not a real identity. 2d. [1]The soul is immortal. "A spirit," saith Christ, "hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." A spirit is not divisible, has no parts, and occupies no perceptible space. 3d. The soul is IMMORTAL—lives when the body is dead. (1.) [2]The first argument is its *indivisibility*. Change takes place in the natural world because its component parts can be separated. Simple bodies can be destroyed by no known law —only by Almighty power. (2.) The strong impressions upon the minds of men generally of an after state of existence, is evidence of the soul's immortality. (3.) The existence of a conscience

1. What is its nature? 2. How do you prove that the soul is immoral? Repeat heads?

among all nations—a dread of death and the future, and desires after some sort of religion, afford some evidence of the immortality of the soul. (4.) Its vast capacities—its capability of advancing from one degree of perfection to another, so far as we can see without any limitation, different from animals, argues that its period of improvement will not terminate when it has just commenced. To say it, were to impeach the wisdom and benevolence of the Deity. (5.) Its boundless desires. Nothing temporary or material satisfies it. It soars away after something beyond the finite—it grasps at infinity. (6.) But after all, life and *immortality* is brought to light *only* in the gospel. All the promises and threatenings in the Bible are based upon it. It offers *eternal life*—threatens *everlasting death.*

## RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

[1] "For the hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." [2] The various changes through which the body passes from infancy to age, and at death, will be no obstacle to its being raised. [3] Of the various particles composing the body at differ-

1. Will there be a resurrection? 2. The bodies of men have been decomposed, and the particles have entered into the composition of other bodies, can they be collected and raised? 3. Which of the various bodies will be raised?

ent periods, such, and so many, will be collected and combined as to constitute a body, known and recognized by ourselves and others, as *our own body*. Though I have not a particle of the same matter in my body that composed it ten years age, it is known and recognized as identically the same, and will be ten thousand years hence. [1] At death the soul and body separate; the body, laid in the grave, passes through the changes common to matter; [2] the soul takes its immediate departure to God, who gave it, and is made immediately happy or miserable. [3] *To-day*," said Christ to the penitent thief, "shalt thou be with me in paradise." Luke, 23: 43. [3] Christ, with his human body, arose from the dead and was seen by many after his resurrection. Whether the body, when it is raised, will have the appearance of age or youth, the scriptures have not informed us. "God giveth it a body as it *hath pleased him*, and to every seed *his own body*;" which will be a spiritual, not a material and corruptible body—not flesh and blood.

The resurrection from the dead is argued, 1st. [4] From the resurrection of Christ, 1 Cor. 15: as Christ's *body* was raised, so will ours also be. 2d. From the general judgment. All those passages which speak of a general judgment, prove the resurrection. 3d. From numerous passages of scrip-

1. What takes place at death? 2. Does the soul sleep after death till the resurrection? 3. Proof. 4. What are the arguments to prove the resurrection from the dead? Repeat the heads.

ture. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," 1 Cor. 15: 22; i. e. as in Adam all die a *temporal death*, so in Christ all shall be raised from the dead. Math. 22: 23. Job. 19: 25–27. Isai. 26: 19. Phil. 2: 20. 1 Cor. 15. Dan. 12: 2. Thess. 4: 14. Rev. 20: 13. The resurrection will immediately precede the general judgment. [1]At the end of the world, the natural bodies of those found alive will be changed to spiritual bodies, without seeing death. "Then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." 1 Thess. 4: 17.

### THE GENERAL JUDGMENT.

Is the period assigned for the trial of men and devils. [2]God "hath appointed a day, wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by Jesus Christ." This is the day for which all other days were made—the termination of the dispensation of grace to a fallen world—the end of time and the opening of a vast eternity. "The heavens and the earth which now exist, are by the word of God, reserved in store unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Pet. 3: 7. The proofs of a general judgment are these, 1st. [3]The justice of God requires it. Here the righteous

1. What will be done with those who are alive on earth at the resurrection? 2. Will there be a general judgment? 3. How do you prove it? Repeat the heads?

often suffer, whilst the wicked are prospered. 2d. From the relations of men to God we must expect it. He is our ruler and we his disobedient subjects. 3d. It seems to be necessary to exhibit God's true character; to show more clearly his love of holiness and his abhorrence of sin; to vindicate his justice. 4th. The scriptures abundantly assert it. Jude, 14: 15. 2 Cor. 5: 10. Math. 25. Rom. 14: 10, 11. 2 Thess. 1: 7, 10. [1]The judgment is appointed at the end of time, so that the influence of each individual's course of conduct may be fairly seen, all will then be judged according to the deeds done in the body. Rev. 20: 12. The trial will be fair and impartial. [2]CHRIST will be the Judge. The saints will first appear on trial, be approved, and then sit as associate Judges with Christ. "Know ye not that the saints shall judge the earth?" The happiness of the saints will be eternal and *inexpressibly great*. [3]Each capacity for enjoyment, though different, will be completely filled. The happiness of heaven will consist, 1st. [4]In freedom from sin. 2d. In the enjoyment of God's presence—the peculiar manifestations of his glory. God is the chief good—drinking from the river of his pleasure—an overwhelming sense of his love. 3d. In perfect satisfaction and peace. 4th. In engaging actively in his service with

---

1. Why is not the trial of every individual concluded at death? 2. Who will be the judge? 3 How great will be the happiness of the saints in heaven? 4. In what will it consist? Heads.

thankful hearts. 5th. In associating saints and angels. As Peter, James and John knew Moses and Elias in the mount, so saints will recognize each other in heaven. 6th. In contemplating the plan of redemption. 7th. In examining the mysteries of God's providence. Many dark providences will then be made clear. 8th. In advancement in knowledge and admiring the works of God.

The wicked will also be arraigned and judged and sentenced. "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." We argue the future punishment of the wicked,

1. [1]From the fact that a place of punishment is so often *alluded to* in the Bible. "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in *no case* enter into the kingdom of heaven." Math. 5: 20. "Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, &c., shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." Math. 7: 21. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." John, 3: 3. "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God; be not deceived, neither fornicators nor idolators, &c., shall inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10. Speaking of the works of the flesh, says the apostle, "They that do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5: 21. The Revelator, speaking of heaven, says, "There shall in *no*

1. What arguments prove the future punishment of the wicked? Heads

*wise* enter into it any thing that defileth," &c. Rev. 21: 27, and 22: 15.

2. From the fact that the place of punishment is expressly mentioned. "The wicked shall be turned into *hell*, and all the nations that forget God." Ps. 9: 17. To say that hell here means the grave, is to render the passage destitute of meaning. Both the wicked and the righteous are turned into the grave, but the *wicked* are turned into *hell*. "Every tree," speaking of the children of Abraham, "which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire." Math. 3: 10. "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." v. 12. "Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in *hell*," 10: 28, "and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." 13: 42. The sentence of the wicked is, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into *everlasting* fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Math. 25: 41.

3. From the fact that some are expressly mentioned as being in a place of punishment. "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." 2 Pet. 2: 4. The rich man, "*in hell*, lifted up his eyes, being in torment." Luke, 16: 23. Rev. 19: 20, 20: 14.

4. From the *earnest exhortations* to induce men to escape the place of torment and obtain everlast-

ing life. "Strive [*agonize*] to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in and shall not be able." Luke, 13: 24. Math. 7: 13, 14. "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" Ezek. 33: 11. "As I live, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." "O, do not that abominable thing which my soul hates." "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come." "The Spirit and the bride say, *come*." Men are cautioned to take heed to themselves—to take heed how they build—be not deceived, &c., all showing that there is imminent danger in a sinful and thoughtless life.

5. The awful denunciations against the finally impenitent, show that future punishment is certain. Stronger and plainer language could not be used. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1: 7–9. "Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish shall be upon every soul of man that doeth evil." "A fire is kindled in mine anger that shall burn to the deepest hell." "*Wo* unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him." Isai. 3: 11. "*O wicked man, thou shalt surely die.*" Ezek. 33: 8.

6. It is impossible to account for the conduct of

the apostles, or the Jews, unless they believed in future punishment. The disciples were made poor and penniless, the offscouring of all things, for the sake of preaching salvation through Christ. They went from place to place declaring such doctrines as greatly enraged the Jews, who many times beat, stoned and imprisoned them. Now it is inconceivable that the apostles would have made sacrifice of comfort and friends, and have endured such sufferings merely to tell the wicked Jews, and the murderers of Christ, that they would be forever happy. And it is inconceivable that such preaching should have so much enraged the Jews, or the opposers of religion in any age. And finally,

7. It is impossible to account for the language of Christ or the apostles on many occasions, if they did not mean to teach the future and eternal punishment of the finally wicked. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." The Greek word, *aonion*, used for everlasting, is the same word translated eternal, and is the strongest word that can be selected to express the idea of endless duration.

Remark 1st. If there be no endless punishment, [1]then *all* are safe; [2]if there be, there is safety only for those who make preparations to escape it. It is the part of wisdom to be fully prepared.

2d. [3]The belief in endless punishment tends to

1. Suppose there is no hell? 2. Suppose there is? 3. What is the influence of this belief?

[illegible]
the great[illegible]
of men, and [illegible]
of endless punishm[illegible]
believers and rejecto[illegible]
its rejection tends to [illegible]
belief in it increases respect for religion and the worship of God. Of the various systems of religion, that is evidently true which exerts the best influence.

# APPENDIX.

## CHURCH OFFICERS.

These are Pastors or Bishops. 1 Tim. 3: 1. Eph. 4: 11. Ruling Elders, 1 Tim. 5: 17, and Deacons, Phil. 1: 1.

A person believing himself called to preach the gospel, is to be examined by the Presbytery, under whose care he places himself, as to his acquaintance with experimental religion, the motives which influence him to seek the sacred office, and in reference to his intellectual qualifications. Presbytery being satisfied of his fitness for the ministerial office, license him to preach the gospel. He is then called a *licentiate.* His license may be recalled by Presbytery if they think proper.

## ORDINATION AND INSTALLATION.

*Ordination* invests the candidate with all the functions of the ministerial office, and authorizes him to administer the *Sacraments,* which he could not do when merely licensed.—A minister may be ordained as a bishop, or pastor, or as an evangelist, having no particular charge. When he is ordained as a pastor, he is also *installed.* For this purpose a *call* is made out by the congregation desiring his service, signed either by all the male members of the congregation, by a committee appointed *for that purpose,* or by the trustees. On his acceptance of the call, he promises the faithful performance of the duties of the pastoral office, whilst they promise him all due subjection and support. Presbytery then instal him as pastor. It is the duty of the trustees to attend to the secular interest of the congregation, and to see that the engagements with the pastor are promptly met. Ministers not installed are called *stated supplies.*

## RULING ELDERS

Are the representatives of the church, and are chosen by them for the purpose of assisting pastors in the exercise of

government and discipline, of conducting meetings in the absence of the pastor, and of watching over the church.

### DEACONS

Are also chosen by the church for the purpose of taking care of the poor, and of distributing the collections which may be taken up for their use. The temporal affairs of the church may be committed to them.

### THE SESSION

Is composed of the elders, and pastor or pastors of a particular congregation. The pastor is Moderator, by virtue of his office. The session has power to inquire into the conduct of the members, to receive members, to admonish, rebuke, suspend or exclude those deserving of censure. The session must appoint a clerk and keep a record of all its proceedings, which is reviewed by Presbytery once a year.

### THE PRESBYTERY

Consists of all the ministers, and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district. Vacant congregations may also send a delegate to Presbytery. Three ministers and as many elders as may be present, form a quorum. "The Presbytery has power to receive and issue appeals from church sessions and references brought before them in an orderly manner; to examine and license candidates for the holy ministry; to ordain, install, remove, and judge ministers; to examine and approve or censure the records of church sessions; to resolve questions of doctrine or discipline seriously and reasonably proposed; to condemn erroneous opinions, which injure the purity or peace of the church; to visit particular churches, for the purpose of inquiring into their state, and redressing the evils that may have arisen in them; to unite or divide congregations, at the request of the people, or to form or receive new congregations, and in general to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their care."

"It shall be the duty of the Presbytery to keep a full and fair record of their proceedings, and to report to the Synod,

every year, licensures, ordinations, the receiving or dismissing of members, the removal of members by death, the union or division of congregations, or the formation of new ones; and in general, all the important changes which may have taken place within their bounds in the course of the year."

### THE SYNOD

Is a convention of all the ministers and an elder from each congregation, within a district of several Presbyteries. Seven ministers and as many elders as may be present constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

"The Synod has power to receive and issue all appeals regularly brought up from the presbyteries; to decide on all references made to them; to review the records of presbyteries, and approve or censure them; to redress whatever has been done by presbyteries contrary to order; to take effectual care that presbyteries observe the constitution of the church; to erect new presbyteries, and unite or divide those which were before erected; generally to take such order with respect to the presbyteries, sessions, and people under their care, as may be in conformity with the word of God and the established rules, and which tend to promote the edification of the church; and, finally, to propose to the general assembly, for their adoption, such measures as may be of common advantage to the whole church."

### THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Is the highest judicatory of the church, and consists of one minister and one elder for every twenty-four ministers in any presbytery. Those chosen are commissioners. Their expenses are borne by the presbytery sending them. The money raised is put into a fund and distributed, and is called the commissioners' fund. Any presbytery can bear the expenses of its own delegate without putting the money into this fund. Fourteen ministers and seven elders constitute a quorum. The general assembly reviews the records of every synod and exercises a general supervision over the church.

### DISCIPLINE.

Members of the church guilty of improper conduct, are

brought before the session, by a citation issued by the session, and served by the clerk. The case may be brought before the session by common fame, or by complaint. In either case the process is similar after the case is brought before session. The accused is considered innocent until the charge is proved against him. The accused is allowed every lawful means of defending himself and of invalidating the testimony which appears against him. Each charge must be substantiated by two witnesses. If not satisfied with the decision of the session, he can appeal to the presbytery, and from the Presbytery to the synod and to the general assembly.

---

## QUESTIONS FOR SELF-EXAMINATION.

### FOR SABBATH EVENING.

Did I yesterday make all necessary preparations for the Sabbath, so that I could enter upon this holy day unencumbered by worldly cares, or labor? Did I retire to rest with a quiet conscience? With every sin repented of? With a strong desire after holiness? Did I pray for the presence of my Heavenly Father and my blessed Savior on this day? Did I pray for my minister and for a blessing on his labors to-day? What were my meditations on retiring to rest? To what were my first thoughts directed on waking this holy morning? Have I endeavored steadily to exclude all worldly thoughts during the day? Have I allowed of no worldly conversation? Have I felt the Sabbath to be a delight and a blessing? Did I pray for God's presence in the sanctuary before going? Did I join in heart, if not vocally in the exercises of prayer and praise? Or was I gazing upon others whilst these exercises were being performed? Was my soul lifted up in prayer whilst the minister was preaching, that every sentence might find way to the heart? Did I not give too much of the sermon to others? Did I on entering the house of God reverently and silently take my seat, and immediately lift up my heart to God for his presence to fill the house? Have I gained any spiritual strength to-day? Do I feel a strong determination to perform every known duty and refrain from every sin during this week? Do I mean to attend the weekly prayer meeting? Will I strive to keep eternity in view, and live so as to be prepared for death, and after I have done all in my power, do I trust to Christ as a helpless sinner for salvation, as though I had done nothing?

## SELF-EXAMINATION.

The following form of self-examination was prepared by the Rev. Dr. GRIFFEN.

I. GOD.—In my love to GOD am I affected with mere kindness without a moral character? or do I love that *holiness* which seeks to bottom the happiness of the universe upon holy order? which requires me to love him better than myself? which hates sin as the disturber of the public order and happiness? which hates and forbids *my* sins? And do I love that *justice* (another name for universal rectitude) which respects the *rights* of all beings, and in defence of the rights of the universe, punishes sin? Do I rejoice that such a God reigns? Do I love to lie at his feet and look up from the dust and see him on the throne? In the most trying scenes do I *submit* to him? Am I glad that all my interests and circumstances are at his disposal? Do I *depend* on him for all things? Can I *trust* him for all that I need for time and eternity? Is it my supreme desire to see him known and honored as God? Is it my sincere wish and purpose to serve him all my days? to promote the benevolent interests of his kingdom? to recommend him to all? Do I love to be in his presence and commune with him in prayer? Is it because he is there that I wish to be in heaven? Am I *thankful* to him for my rational existence, my unnumbered comforts, and my immortal hopes? For love like this, do I feel incapable of making any returns, and put myself down for an everlasting bankrupt? Is it a joy to reflect that God will be his own reward, all that reward to himself that he ever expected or desired? that he is infinitely happy in gratified benevolence?

II. LAW.—Do I love the divine law? Does it appear glorious that GOD forbids all selfishness, pride, and idolatrous attachment to the creature, and requires men to love him with all the heart, and their neighbor as themselves? Does it appear glorious that he has taken such strong measures to render this lovely and harmonizing temper universal, by promising to reward it with endless joys, and threatening the opposite with eternal death? Do the threatenings, and the execution of them, appear just? Does this blessed law, proceeding from the heart of God as a stream from the fountain, show him to me full of the very love which the law requires?

III. SIN.—Have I the deepest sense of sin when I have the clearest views of God? Do I hate sin? and chiefly be-

cause it is against him? Do I long to be delivered from it, more than from any other evil? Do I pant after universal holiness with groanings which cannot be uttered? and that, not so much for the reward, as because it is right and agreeable to the will of God? Are the remains of indwelling sin my greatest grief and burden? Do I realizingly feel that I deserve eternal death? Do I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes? Do I *love* to repent? Is it a luxury to lie low in the dust at the feet of GOD and mourn for sin? Am I generally the happiest when I feel the most unworthy? Did I ever see myself to be utterly undone; unable to induce GOD to change my heart or pardon my sins, and too desperately wicked to think a good thought of myself? and did I then cast myself helpless and dead upon his *self-moving* power and mercy? Did I see my perishing need of a Savior, through whom alone that power and mercy could be exercised?

IV. CHRIST.—Does it appear to me a *reality* that Christ died for sinners, to answer the end of their punishment? Do I fully credit the oath by which GOD constituted his Son the High Priest of the world and engaged to accept his sacrifice and intercession for sinners? Do I realize the sincerity of the invitation and promise as extended to me, and that God will certainly receive me for Christ's sake if I go to him aright? Does the whole Bible appear more true and more precious than it once did? Do I find that a view of my own vileness and of the awful purity of God is necessary to give me a sense of that glorious High Priest? And does a view of that glorious High Priest, so necessary for my acceptance with God, make me feel that I am polluted and vile? Do I really depend upon His death as the ground of my pardon? Do I hope to receive all positive good as his reward? Do I cast myself upon his intercession? Do I see that, vile as I am, I may go to God through him? Do I see him to be a medium through which a whole world may come? and do I long that all should see him as he is and should go to God by him? Does this way of salvation appear glorious, as supporting all the holy principles of the law, disclosing the wonderful perfections of God, and saving a guilty world? Is it my hearty wish to be saved in no other way? Is Christ precious to my soul; the chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely? Do I esteem all things but dross in comparison with the knowledge of Jesus Christ my Lord? Does that cross crucify me to sin and the world? Do I feel my-

self not my own, but bought with a price? and have I heartily consecrated all that I am and have to the service of my Redeemer? Have I not kept back a part? Are my powers, my time, my influence, my property, my friends, all devoted, and held ready to be employed or resigned as fast as he shall call? Am I willing to deny myself and even to die for his name's sake? Do I long to see his kingdom advanced, more than any other interest? And when I see it do I rejoice more than in great riches? Is it ravishing to see the Lamb in the midst of his Father's throne, extolled and honored by all heaven? Do I long to be there, casting my crown at his feet, and ascribing to him all the glory of my salvation? Will that constitute the sweetest part of my heaven?

V. Obedience.—Do I habitually obey *all* God's commands? Is there no single sin that I habitually indulge? Is there no single neglect that I habitually allow? Do I select and pursue my business, and regulate my expenses, and conduct my intercourse with society, from a sacred regard to divine authority? Do I act with a sensible reference to this from hour to hour? Do I habitually know what it is to be moved to action by the love of God, and to draw from him all my motives to active service and holy living? Does my religion reduce my selfishness, pride, and love, and make me more and more disinterested, humble, dead to the world, and devoted to God?

VI. My Neighbor.—Is there a human being on the face of the earth whom I would harm? at whose calamity I would rejoice? to whom I do not wish well? whom I would not befriend if in my power? Take my rival in business or honor,—my greatest enemy; and am I hurt at any assault upon his feelings or good name? In my temper and conduct do I render to him what I might reasonably wish him to render to me? Do I feel more benevolently than I once did towards all mankind? Do I make conscience of doing them daily all the good in my power? Do I daily deny myself for others in little things? Do I conscientiously discharge my *relative* duties? Am I charitable to the poor to the extent of my means? Am I concerned for the spiritual interests of those around me? and do I show it in my prayers and in my faithful dealings with them? Have I a special delight in the character and company of christians?

## LOVEST THOU ME?

'Tis a point I long to know,
Oft it causes anxious thought:—
Do I love the Lord, or no?
Am I his, or am I not?

If I love, why am I thus?
Why this dull, this lifeless frame?
Hardly, sure, can they be worse,
Who have never heard his name.

Could my heart so hard remain,
Pray'r a task and burden prove—
Ev'ry trifle give me pain—
If I knew a Savior's love?

When I turn mine eyes within,
All is dark, and vain, and wild;
Fill'd with unbelief and sin—
Can I deem myself a child?

If I pray, or hear, or read,
Sin is mix'd with all I do:
You who love the Lord indeed,
Tell me—is it thus with you?

Yet I mourn my stubborn will,
Find my sin a grief and thrall;
Should I grieve for what I feel,
If I did not love at all?

Lord decide the doubtful case!
Thou who art thy people's Sun
Shine upon thy work of grace,
If it be indeed begun.

Let me love thee more and more,
If I love at all, I pray;
If I have not lov'd before,
Help me to begin to-day.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

e Monticello

Fullerton &c

BS605 .S3
Scofield, S. R.
The Christian s manual : containing a h

BS
605
S3

Scofield, S R

The Christian's manual : containing a
of the Bible ... : to which are attache
tions, adapted to the instruction of fa
sabbath-schools, and Bible classes : wi
pendix / by S.R. Scofield. -- Ithaca, N
Andrus, Gauntlett, 1850.
308p. ; 18cm.

Imperfect copy: p.299 mutilated, obsc
part of text.

1. Bible--Study-- Text-books. I.

428162
CCS